

# The Classical Review

MAY, 1912

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### THEOGNIDEA.

93. εἴ τις ἐπαινῆσθαι σε τόσον χρόνον  
ὅσσον ὀρώης,  
νοσφισθεῖς δ' ἄλλη γλώσσαν ἱῆσι  
κακήν.

ὀρώης A, ὀρώης O, ὀρώη cet. Cobet seems to me right in preferring the third person to the second; it corresponds properly to νοσφισθεῖς in the next line, and besides it is awkward to have to supply αὐτόν after ὀρώης. But why do A and O give the second person? And why the change to the optative? I think Theognis said ὀρήσι, and if Cobet is also right in demanding ἐπαινῆσθαι, we then have the present subjunctive, as we should expect, all through the sentence.

ὀρήσι was easily changed into ὀρήης, and then lengthened into ὀρώης for the metre.

117. κιβδήλου δ' ἀνδρὸς γυνῶναι χαλε-  
πώτερον οὐδέν,  
Κύρην, οὐδ' εὐλαβίης ἐστὶ περὶ  
πλέονος.

This will not construe, but it is clear that the sense required is 'nothing needs greater caution.' Bergk brackets περί, 'quod corrector aliquis adiecit, ut versum suppleret.' So far so good, but his substitution of βροτοῖς is rather feeble. M. Schmidt's δέι περὶ τευ πλέονος gets in the δέι which we expect, though Bergk is of course right in saying that εὐλαβίης ἐστὶ is possible, but it knocks the line about more than

is needed, and περί τευ does not look plausible.

What is clear, then, is this. Textually we have to fill up a gap between ἐστί and πλέονος, and the sense leads us to expect δέι. Read ἐσθ' ὅ τι δέι πλέονος. ὅ τι is of course accusative. In Homer the verb used for this construction is χρή, in Aeschylus it is δέι, and Theognis is nearer to Aeschylus. Metrically also δέι is superior, for Theognis does not like to keep a vowel short before a mute and liquid without necessity.

169. ὅν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν, ὃ καὶ μωμέ-  
μενος αἰνεῖ.

It is impossible to believe that any poet can have said such a thing as this, nor does τιμῶσ' ὅν, adopted by Bergk from one MS., mend things at all. κοιμεύμενος ἄνει Ahrens, which does give a sort of sense perhaps. Is μωμέμενος a corruption of μὴ μώμενος? If so, we can end with Schneidewin's ἀγρεῖ or Hartung's αἰρεῖ; but I should rather suspect that ἡῶρεν was changed to αἰνεῖ after μωμεύμενος had displaced μὴ μώμενος. 'He finds even without seeking.' Cf. 415, οὐδέν' ὁμοῖον ἐμοὶ δύναμαι διζήμενος εὐρεῖν.

For deliberate changes of this kind cf. 1053, where A alone preserves μαινομένων πέτεται; all other MSS. have a text in which μαινομένων had been corrupted to μαρναμένων, and πέτεται had been changed in consequence to μάχεται.

And 1162 is given by all MSS. in the form :

αἰτοῦσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι, Κύρνε, δίδου,

This looks well enough in itself, but does not suit the previous line, and luckily the couplet is repeated at 409, where the true reading appears as :

αἰδοῦς ἢ τ' ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι, Κύρν',  
ἔπεται.

Here again ἔπεται has been changed to δίδου in order to go with αἰτοῦσιν.

μωμεύμενος is, moreover, a false form for Theognis.

271. ἴσως τοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοὶ θνητοῖς  
ἀνθρώποις

γῆράς τ' οὐλόμενον καὶ νεότητ'  
ἔδοσαν.

τῶν πάντων δὲ κάκιστον ἐν ἀνθρώ-  
ποις, θανάτου τε

καὶ πασέων νούσων ἐστὶ πονη-  
ρότερον,

παῖδας ἐπεὶ θρέψαιο καὶ ἄρμενα  
πάντα παράσχοις,

χρήματα δ' εἰ καταθῆς, πόλλ'  
ἀνιηρὰ παθῶν,

τὸν πατέρ' ἐχθαίρουσι, καταρῶνται  
δ' ἀπολέσθαι,

καὶ στυγέουσ' ὥσπερ πτωχὸν  
ἐπερχόμενον.

That there is something wrong about the expression of this is obvious; hence Schneidewin proposes δ' ὁ κάκιστον in 273. Rather ἐν πάντων δὲ κάκιστον (cf. 841), with a colon after πονηρότερον. Then ἐπεὶ with optative, followed by εἰ δέ with subjunctive, can scarcely be right, but I see no certain way of correcting it; εἰ καταθῆς is Bergk's conjecture for ἐγκαταθῆς. If it be right, the tone is: 'Suppose you should have brought up children, then if you are to . . .' But καταθῆς is the wrong voice; read καταθῇ and compare 409: οὐδένα θησαυρὸν πρὶσιν καταθήσῃ ἀμείνω. The supposed reference (Bergk) to depositing money in a temple is mere harrilation; the point is that even if you lay up money for your children painfully, yet they wish you dead; indeed, they wish it all the more, that they may inherit at once,

Who cries, "Like an ungrateful son,  
My father's damned and all's my  
own."

333. μή ποτε φεύγοντ' ἄνδρα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι,  
Κύρνε, φιλήσῃς,  
οὐδὲ γὰρ οἴκαδε βὰς γίγεται  
αὐτὸς ἔτι.

Why Bergk should say 'fort. αὐτός' is more than I know. Homer uses αὐτός for ὁ αὐτός several times; hence in his description of the Great Bear, ἢ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται should be construed 'turns in the same place.'

But what sort of antithesis to φεύγειν is οἴκαδε βαίνειν? And οὐδέ is no sense at all. If Theognis had said, 'Don't make friends with an exile, for even when he's in trouble you can't trust him,' then οὐδέ would have been to the point. But obviously we cannot say 'even when he is restored to his city' in this context. οὐ γὰρ οἴκον γε βὰς might be some sense, οὐδὲ οἴκαδε βὰς is none at all. We should get the proper antithesis and sense if we read οὐδεὶς γὰρ καταβάς. But I know not of any instance of καταβῆναι = κατελθεῖν.

444. ἀθανάτων δὲ δόσεις  
παντοῖαι θνητοῖσιν ἐπέρχοντ'.

O has a variant ἐπέρχεται which looks right; the schema Pindaricum was not invented by Pindar. Theognis very seldom has a bacchius before the bucolic diaeresis; at 695 qu. παρασχέμεν for παρασχεῖν?

475. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, μέτρον γὰρ ἔχω μελιθεός  
οἶνον,

ὑπνὸν λυσικάκου μνήσομαι οἴκαδ'  
ἰών.

ἦξω δ' ὥς οἶνος χαριέστατος ἀνδρὶ  
πεπόσθαι,

οὐτ' ἔτι νήφων ὦν οὔτε λίην  
μεθύων.

The text of the last line is most uncertain, but it is generally agreed that we must have two participles in it. For ἦξω two inferior MSS. have δέξω, which Bergk accepts; it may be nothing but a bad conjecture, but there is also much probability in the suggestion of Mr. Williams that it is a corruption of εἶξω. Athenaeus quotes the lines with ἦκω, and Mr. Richards defends this; but could ἦκω ὥς οἶνος κ.τ.λ. really mean 'I have come to that point where wine is most gracious'?

And Mr. Williams truly remarks that we cannot lay any stress on the reading of Athenaeus, because he begins the quotation with this word and may have altered it to suit his own purpose. But, if we are to suppose the sense to be what Mr. Richards says, we must stick to ἡκω, for the future is then impossible, in spite of Messrs. Harrison and Williams. The author is already half seas over and refuses to drink any more; he *has* come to the haven where he would be; therefore he could not say 'I *will* come.'

We must start from ἡξω, I think, and I cannot but believe it to be corrupt, nor do any of the conjectures proposed satisfy me. Perhaps the poet said στέρξω, 'I will be content to be neither sober nor drunk, which is the best way for wine to have been taken.' I suppose the first two letters to have been lost, as often at the beginning of a line; ἐρξω was then nonsense and was easily corrupted; perhaps hence came Mr. Williams's εἰξω, and thence the other readings flowed naturally.

535. οὐ ποτε δουλείη κεφαλὴ ἰθεῖα  
πέφυκεν,  
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ σκολιή, καυχένα λοξὸν  
ἔχει.

Read κεφαλὴν, 'slavery is never straight of head, but has her neck twisted.' We thus escape an ugly hiatus, and also we get a much better subject for ἔχει.

597. δὴν δὲ, παῖ, φίλοι ὦμεν· ἀτάρ τ'  
ἄλλοισιν ὁμίλει.

This line is repeated at 1243 with ἔπειτ' for ἀτάρ τ'. The MSS. at both places have καί, altered by Bergk to παῖ, and καί is indefensible. But I seek vainly to understand why anyone should say: 'Let us be long friends, but do you associate with others.' If the point is that you may seek other friends if you like but let us still be friends, surely we want ἡμεῖς in very badly, and it would have been easy to write ἡμεῖς δὲ φίλοι ὦμεν or the like. Then, too, at both places the pentameter contains a reproach; 598 tells the boy to look for friends more congenial, 1244 tells him that he is faithless. Plainly it is absurd to begin such

couplets by hoping for long friendships. Again, δὴν is odd to my feeling in a wish for the future, and consider the δὴ.

'Let us be friends no longer' would give good sense, but the right correction is ἡμεν<sup>1</sup> for ὦμεν. 'We have been long dear to each other,' says the author with regret and reproach in his voice, 'but now I'm no longer good enough for you; go to your new companions.'

ἀτάρ τ' is manifestly the original, ἔπειτ' the corruption.

609. προσαμαρτῇ, the reading of A, is the best; it is the Homeric ἀμαρτεῖν = ὁμαρτεῖν.

667. εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι, Σιμωνίδη,  
οἶά περ ἤδη,  
οὐκ ἂν ἀνιόμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι  
συνών.

ἤδη A, ἥδειν cet. Neither ἤδη nor ἥδη gives any tolerable meaning, or indeed any decent construction, but the remedy is simple; read ἥθη. 'Were my fortune as good as my character.' For the plural of ἥθος see 970.

729. φροντίδες ἀνθρώπων ἔλαχον πτερά  
ποικίλ' ἔχουσai,  
μυρόμεναι ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ  
βιότου.

As ἔλαχον has nothing to govern, Hartung conjectures ἀνθρώπους, but Bergk is justly dissatisfied with such a statement as φροντίδες ἀνθρώπους ἔλαχον. A man may receive care for his portion; nobody would say that care received the man. Then μυρόμεναι is absurd; a φροντίς cannot μύρεσθαι. Many MSS. add δ' before or after ἀνθρώπων; where does this come from? And what is the point of describing the φροντίδες as having wings?

The poet wrote:—

φροντίδες ἀνθρώπους ἔδακον πτέρα ποικίλ'  
ἔχουσai,  
μυρομένους ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ βιότου.

The cares are like gnats or wasps, winged things that bite or sting. The δ' is a correction of ἔλαχον, got into the wrong place. ἀνθρώπων was written carelessly by someone with the sorrows

<sup>1</sup> The present would here, I think, be inappropriate.

of men in his head; *μυρομένους* was then left stranded and was altered to *μυρόμεναι* that it might have something to agree with; bad emenders seldom scruple about writing what no poet would ever think of.

Bergk suggests *τούς* for *τῶν* at 814, and it certainly looks necessary.

819. ἐς πολυάρητον κακὸν ἤκομεν, ἔνθα  
    μάλιστα,  
    Κύρνε, συναμφοτέρους μοῖρα λάβοι  
    θανάτον.

This has sorely perplexed the commentators, but it is simple enough. The *κακόν* is old age which is much prayed for, but is an evil none the less. Cf. Menander *frag. incert.* 26 (Meineke).

It is astonishing that anyone should refuse Bergk's *μαθεῖν* in the preceding line; the sentiment is repeated by Aeschylus, *P.V.* 651, 2.

923. οὐτῶ, Δημόκλειε, κατὰ χρέματ'  
    ἄριστον ἀπάντων.

*Qu. χρέματα λῶστον?* The weak caesura in the fourth foot is studiously avoided in this collection, unless there be a strong one in the fifth. The only exception is 1171, a passage stamped with the *σφρηγὶς*, and therefore to be presumed to be by Theognis himself; it is easy to correct it, however, by transposition to *διδούσι θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν*.

In 928 is the phrase *χρέματ' ἄριστον ἔχειν*, which need not be altered; these poets use *λῶστον* and *ἄριστον* indifferently and promiscuously as suits the scansion; cf. 421.

945. εἶμι παρὰ στάθμην ὀρθὴν ὁδὸν  
    οὐδετέρωσσε  
    κλινόμενος· χρεὶ γάρ μ' ἄρτια  
    πάντα νοεῖν.

*πᾶσι* makes much better sense, and was easily corrupted by the proximity of *ἄρτια*. Cf. 543:

χρεὶ με παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα τήνδε  
    δικάσσαι,  
    Κύρνε, δίκην, ἴσόν τ' ἀμφοτέροισι  
    δόμεν.

945 is ascribed with great probability to Solon, at 543 Theognis imitates him. Solon speaks of all classes at Athens, Theognis applies the couplet to a strife between two men, and his *ἀμφοτέροισι* thus corresponds to *πᾶσι*.

1001. χέρνιβα δ' αἶψα θύραζε φέροι  
    στεφανώματα δ' εἶσω.

δ' εἶσω A, Athenaeus, *δήσοι* cet. *εἶσω* is no sense, for why should the girl bring the water *out* and the garlands *in*? Was the original δ' οἶσοι, the mixed aorist optative of *φέρω*? The form is so different from *φέροι* that the two words might be used together, I think. The difference is indeed greater than that between *εἰλήφει* and *λαβών* in Isaeus vii. 34, *ἐμοῦ δὲ πείραν εἰλήφει, δοκιμασίαν ἱκανὴν λαβών*.

1193. ἀσπάλαθοι δὲ τάπησιν ὁμοῖον  
    στρώμα θανόντι.

This scansion cannot be paralleled from Theognis. Read *ὁμοῖοι*; either construction is equally good.

ARTHUR PLATT.

#### A NOTE ON THE EASTERN TRADE-ROUTE IN ASIA MINOR.

THE object of the following paper is to bring together certain facts, which point to an earlier date than has hitherto been supposed, for the great trade-route running across Asia Minor from the lower Maeander valley to the Cilician gates. Although this route is by far the easiest approach from the Aegean to the interior of Asia Minor, its importance in early days, as Sir William Ramsay has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> was over-

shadowed by the 'Royal Road,' which took a more northerly direction to Boghaz Keui. Until the first century B.C. we have no direct literary testimony<sup>2</sup> as to the importance of the 'trade-route,' although the fragment of Hipponax,<sup>3</sup> quoted by Ramsay, points to a regular intercourse between Miletus and the interior, which can only have passed up the Maeander and Lycus

<sup>2</sup> Artemidorus, ap. Strabo, p. 663.

<sup>3</sup> Hipponax, frag. 36.

<sup>1</sup> *Historical Geography*, p. 38.



valleys. I hope to show that this trade was inherited from an earlier date and extended beyond Apamea-Celaenae.

Evidence is gradually accumulating to prove commercial connection between the Aegean and the interior of Asia Minor during the bronze age. Mr. Dawkins<sup>1</sup> quotes a fragment of a Mycenaean vase found by Mr. Crowfoot on a mound at Ütch Euyuk, on the road from Iconium to Tyana, and the Ashmolean Museum possesses sherds, definitely Mycenaean, from the mound which is probably the site of Derbe.<sup>2</sup> Last year I found a number of flakes of Melian obsidian<sup>3</sup> on a small prehistoric site at Tchukurkend, between Eflatoun Bounar and Kirili Kassaba, on the eastern side of the Beishehir lake.

It is unlikely that these objects should have worked up from the southern coast of Asia Minor. For, as I hope to show in a later paper, the trade of this part of Asia Minor, from the Pamphylian coast eastwards, was with Cyprus rather than with the Aegean.

In discussing the beginnings of the trade-route, Ramsay suggests that its earliest stages are perhaps marked by the two monuments at Fassiler and Eflatoun Bounar.<sup>4</sup> If this is the case, the original line of the road would have been between the long range, known as the Sultan Dagħ, and the Beishehir lake, its later course, as we know from Strabo,<sup>5</sup> being outside and to the north of this mountain barrier.

From the neighbourhood of these two monuments a line of 'tumuli'<sup>6</sup> can be traced round the north-eastern

end of the Beishehir lake and of lake Egerdir as far as Dineir (Apamea-Celaenae). Below this point I have not examined, but it is worth recalling the tumulus observed by Davies<sup>7</sup> in the narrows of the Lycus valley, through which the road must have passed, and opposite Colossae, the early importance of which is noted by Ramsay.<sup>8</sup> The Aegean port for this route would doubtless be Miletus, the importance of whose trade with the interior in early historical times has already been noted,<sup>9</sup> and where recently Wiegand has uncovered a stratum containing Mycenaean remains.<sup>10</sup>

This distribution of the tumulus-sites suggests that the advantages of the trade-route were known at an early date, and we have some explanation of the remains I have described. If the site at Tchukurkend lay directly on the road at this time, it is significant that the greater number of flakes I found were of Melian obsidian, a few only being of the transparent, non-Melian variety, which alone I have hitherto found on prehistoric sites in South-Western Asia Minor.<sup>11</sup>

A hint of the existence of the trade-route is to be found in Homer, who speaks of the staining of ivory by Carian and Maeonian women.<sup>12</sup> It seems a fair conjecture that one of the sources of ivory for the Aegean at this date was by the trade route running from the lower Maeander valley eventually to Northern Syria.<sup>13</sup>

H. A. ORMEROD.

Liverpool.

<sup>1</sup> *J.H.S.*, xxiv., p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> Collected by Sir William Ramsay. Cf. Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, p. 63, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Amongst them was a small core, which shows that the obsidian was imported in a rough state and worked on the spot.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> P. 663.

<sup>6</sup> For the nature of the so-called tumuli in this part of Asia Minor, v. *B.S.A.*, xvi., pp. 94-5. Wherever I have been able to test them, they are formed of the debris of successive settlements, and are not funereal.

<sup>7</sup> *Anatolica*, p. 116.

<sup>8</sup> *Cities and Bishoprics*, i., ch. vi.

<sup>9</sup> v. further, Ramsay, *H.G.*, p. 58.

<sup>10</sup> v. Dawkins, *J.H.S.*, xxviii., p. 334 (from *Sechster vorläufige Bericht über die von dem Königl. Museum untergenommenen Ausgrabungen in Milet und Didyma*. Berlin, 1908).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *B.S.A.*, xvi., p. 102, n. 6. Further finds were made last year.

<sup>12</sup> *Iliad*, iv. 142. For Carians in the Maeander valley and at Miletus, v. *Iliad*, ii. 867.

<sup>13</sup> For this source of ivory at a later date, v. Hogarth, *Ionia and the East*, p. 59.

## HIDDEN QUANTITIES.

THE question of 'Hidden Quantities' was discussed from the practical point of view at the recent General Meeting of the Classical Association in London (January 9, 1912), and in seconding the resolution of Miss Mason, to the effect that hidden quantities should not be marked in school books, I referred to certain difficulties of theory which time did not permit me to expound in full: hence the present article. I do not propose to reconsider the question of practice, important as it is in its bearing upon the work of our schools. I will only say that it seems to me that the conclusion arrived at by the Association in 1906, when it adopted the Report of the Committee on the Spelling and Printing of Latin Texts, was a reasonable one. It was then decided that in texts of Latin authors intended for the use of beginners the quantity of long vowels should be marked, *except in syllables where they would be also long by position*; and another clause of the Report expressed the desire of the Committee that a hand-list of the words in which the natural length of a vowel in a syllable where it would be long by position is definitely established should be prepared and issued by the Association for the use of teachers (*Proceedings*, January, 1906, p. 80). The effect of these two recommendations taken together would be that hidden quantities should not be forced upon the attention of pupils, but that any teachers who desired to introduce them into their own pronunciation should have some authoritative guidance as to the results of research in this field. The learning of hidden quantities by pupils would in this way be left entirely to the ear, as distinct from the eye, and would be picked up to a certain extent by way of unconscious imitation of the teacher. At the same time it would be left open to any teachers who were disinclined to introduce this refinement into their own pronunciation, and would regard the learning of hidden quantities as an unnecessary complication of Latin study, to give the whole question the

go-by. It was clear from the discussion the other day that many teachers are in this latter position, but probably there is a still larger number who, while desirous to perfect their own pronunciation as far as possible, are opposed to increasing in any way the burden of the learner, especially at a time of transition like the present. A correspondent, who has marked hidden quantities in his book, writes: 'Though I never dream of worrying my pupils about them, they naturally pronounce things more or less as I do.'

But whatever may be thought about the desirability of marking hidden quantities in school books, there can be no doubt as to their scientific importance, and everyone would agree that if they are to be marked in school books the editors should agree as to the quantities to be assigned. In most words there is no disagreement among scholars; yet there remain a number of points on which editors are at variance, and on which further light is needed. I will begin by calling attention to two points on which new light has already been thrown.

(1) Till recently it was always supposed that the vowel in the short forms derived from *edo*, 'I eat,' was long, e.g. *ēst*, *ēsse*, *ēssēm*. But within the last four years this has been denied by Vollmer (*Glotta* I. 1. pp. 113-116, 1907), and his conclusions are accepted by such eminent philologists as Skutsch and Niedermann. The latter writes as follows: 'The quantities *ēs*, *ēst*, *ēstur*, *ēsse*<sup>1</sup> are one and all destitute of foundation, and as the comparison of kindred languages points throughout to a short vowel, the athematic forms of the verb meaning *to eat* cannot in future be differentiated in quantity from those of the verb meaning *to be*. Let writers of school books take note of that! Their authoritative position makes it doubly their duty to teach only what is well established (*Berliner*

<sup>1</sup> The perfect participle *ēsus* or *ēssus* (from *ēd-tos*) stands on a different footing; see Niedermann's *Outlines of Latin Phonetics*, translated by Strong and Stewart, § 83 (p. 82) and § 26.

*Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1908, p. 664).<sup>1</sup> The reasons which led earlier inquirers to the adoption of the long vowel are stated by Vollmer, so that every reader has a means of arriving at an opinion of his own. Those who, like myself, are convinced by Vollmer's line of argument will have in future to reform their practice. I called attention to the matter in *The Year's Work* for 1907, p. 98. The origin of the mistake was probably, as Skutsch says, that the length of the syllable *es*, 'thou art,' in Old Latin verse was regarded as due to the length of its vowel instead of to the fact that it originally ended with a double consonant (*ess*); and the supposed long *e* was then transferred to *es*, 'thou eatest.' No one seems to have stepped forward to defend the long *e*, so far as I have observed.

(2) The statement of Cicero (*Orator*, XLVIII. 159) as to the length of every vowel before *ns* and *nf* seems at first sight to settle the question of the pronunciation of words like *infans*, *consul*, *ensor*; but Niedermann (*Outlines of Latin Phonetics*, p. 30 and p. 85) and Sommer (*Handbuch der Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 134 and pp. 254-258) have called attention to the testimony of Quintilian, which is supported by many inscriptions and by the evidence of Romance languages, to the effect that the lengthening of the vowel before *ns* and *nf* was of the nature of a compensatory lengthening due to the dropping of the *n*, the vowel before it being at the same time nasalised. This is fully admitted in regard to *ns* by Hale and Buck (*Latin Grammar*, § 18, note). In other words, the vowel was not lengthened till the *n* disappeared as a consonantal element from the word; and we have the evidence of Velius Longus that Cicero himself pronounced *forēsia*, *Megalēsia*, etc., not *forēnsia*, *Megalēnsia*, etc. Similarly, there is no doubt that the Romans of the classical period pronounced *insula* (cf. Italian *isola*), *mōs*, *ferēs*, not *insula*, *mōns*, *ferēns*, etc. It follows, then, that to pronounce the vowel long and at the

same time to retain the *n* is to mix up the pronunciation of two different periods.<sup>2</sup> There was a time, no doubt, when the *n* was restored, at any rate in spelling, which explains French words like *enfant*, *conseil*; but this must have been later than the time of Quintilian. That the consonant *n* was originally part of these words is shown in some cases by their formation (*mons* from *mont-s*, etc.). The precise date at which it disappeared as a consonant can hardly be fixed. If, then, the vowel before *ns* and *nf* is to be marked as long, some graphic device should be found to indicate the loss of the *n*: e.g. the *n* might be printed in italics (*insula*, *mōns*, etc.).

(3) The following are some isolated points on which new light is needed. I confine myself to common words in regard to which recent authorities differ. As representatives of different views, I have taken the Latin Grammar of Hale and Buck (1903) and two of the most recent and authoritative dictionaries published in Germany in which hidden quantities are marked—Stowasser's *Lat. Schul- und Handwörterbuch*, third edition, revised by Petschenig with the co-operation of Skutsch (1910), and Heinichen's *Kleines Lat. Schulwörterbuch*, revised by Blase and Reeb (1911).<sup>3</sup> I have taken these in preference to Anton Marx's *Hilfsbüchlein für die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale in positionslangen Silben*, because no edition of this work has been published since 1901, and it is generally regarded as a book which must be used with caution. In estimating the evidence, account must be taken of the new rules for the syllabification of Latin words, which are given in a convenient form by Niedermann (*Outlines*, Eng. trans., pp. 90-1), and which follow the principles laid down by Bennett, Dennison, and Hale, to which I referred in *The Year's Work* for 1908, p. 111, and 1909, p. 119. It is obvious that some questions may

<sup>2</sup> Thus we should pronounce either *totiens*, *vicensimus*, or *totiēs*, *vicēsimus*, not *totiēns*, *vicēnsimus*. [But what of Greek *κῆρσας*, etc.?—Ed. C. R.]

<sup>3</sup> The great Thesaurus is not available except for A—D (up to the word *Designo*).

<sup>1</sup> The *e* is also treated as short in the most recent Latin dictionaries published in Germany (Stowasser and Heinichen, referred to below); as to the quantity of *esca* they disagree.

present themselves in a different light when consonants which were previously supposed to belong to a following syllable are recognised as belonging phonetically to the preceding syllable.

(a) The quantity of the vowel before *gn*. H-B give it as short in most words (*Gram.* § 18 b), but St. and Hn. give *māgnus*, *īgnis*, *sīgnum*, etc. (*dīgnus* Hn., *dignus* St.). On the quantity of the *a* in *magnus* depends the pronunciation of the comparative; H-B give *maior* (*maius*, pronounced like 'my use,' § 29, 2), St. and Hn. *māior*. Hn. also marks *māximus* (so, too, Sommer). Similarly, H-B give *peior*, St. and Hn. *pēior*. Words like *ignarus*, *ignavus*, *ignobilis*, *ignominia*, *ignoro*, *ignosco*, *agnosco*, *cognosco* stand on a different footing, as being compounds; the syllabification would be *ig-narus*, *ig-nobilis*, etc., and this would account for the length of the first syllable. H-B give *agnosco*, *cognosco*, *ignosco*; so, too, the Thesaurus (*ag-*, *cog-*); but St. and Hn. give *āgnosco*, *ignosco*, *cōgnosco*, etc. The evidence in favour of the long vowel before *gn* has been collected by W. Heraeus in the *Archiv für Lat. Lex. und Gram.*, vol. xiv. (1906), pp. 393 ff., and 449 ff.

(b) Compounds of *ad* and *dis*; e.g. *ascendo* H-B, St., and the Thesaurus; *āscendo* Hn.; *asto* St. and the Thesaurus, *āsto* Hn.; *distinguo* H-B, St., *dīstinguo* Hn.; *disto* St., *dīsto* Hn. The evidence in favour of the short vowel in cases where a *d* or *s* has fallen out, before *s* is given by Heraeus, p. 452.

(c) The perfects in *-exi*. H-B gives the *e* as long in some cases (*rēxi*, *tēxi*), but short in others (*allexi*, *inspexi*); Hn.

gives it as long in all these verbs, St. in all except the last (*inspexi*).

(d) The principal parts of the following verbs:

emo	ēmi	ēmtum	H-B, Hn.
		emptum	St.
iubeo	iussi	iussum	H-B, Hn.
	iūssi <sup>1</sup>	iūssum	St.
sancio	sānxi	sānctum	H-B, Hein.
	sanxi	sanctum	St.

(e) The verbs in *-sco*. H-B recognise three exceptions to the rule that the vowel before *-sco* was long, viz., *disco*, *posco*, and *compesco*. Of these three, *posco* is given with a long *o* by St. and Hn., and Hn. also marks *disco*, *compesco*. [St.'s marking of these two is amended in his list of *Corrigenda*, p. IV.]

(f) The quantity of the vowel in the demonstrative *hic*, *haec*, *hoc* involves the question of hidden quantities:

hic	haec	hoc	H-B, St.
hīc	haec	hōc	Hn.
hīc or hic	haec	hōc	Postgate

H-B explain the length of *hic* and *hoc*, where they are long, by loss of a final *c* (*hic*=*hicc*).

(g) The following words: *Mānlius* H-B, Hn., and Lindsay in his *Shorter Hist. Lat. Gram.* p. 182, *Manlius* St.; *Mārcellus* H-B, Hn., Lindsay, *Marcellus* St.; *Lārs* H-B, *Lars* St., Hn.; *nārro* St., *narro* Hn.; *lēctus* (bed) Lindsay, *lectus* St., Hn.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston.

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Postgate (*New Latin Primer*) marks *iūssi*, *iūssum*, but in *sanxi*, *sanctum* agrees with Stowasser. In the following forms he disagrees with all the above authorities: the Present *mīlto* and the Perfect and Supine of *cēdo* (*cēssi*, *cēssum*). The Thesaurus, too, has *cessi*, *cessum* (ē).

## ACHAEANS AND HOMER.

THE differences between Mr. Allen and myself, touched on in his *Homerica* 1. 76 'Acheans' (C.R., December, 1911), are, I think, quite unessential. I have nothing to say about the Achaeans as a 'race'—racially different from, say, the people of Attica. I rather suppose, with Mr. Allen, that the people whose manners Homer describes and attributes to his Achaeans 'were a new element or development in or of the

same race.' They have a totally different set of legends from those of Attica; Homer almost boycotts Attica; and the manners and beliefs of his men are not Attic. But 'race' is an inscrutable question: the term is so indefinite; the evidence so scanty.

Mr. Allen argues, however, that whoever lived in the culture of Homer's own time (that is in the culture which Homer describes) did not live in Greece.



It is now plain that the required evidence nowhere exists. Now, the appearance of *fibulae* attests a change from the southern, or Aegean, or Minoan costume, to the smock and cloak, which are the dress of the north. Does Mr. Allen think that, at a given time, the southern dwellers in Greece happened to reject their old swimming drawers or loin-cloths for smock, *fibula*, and cloak? (In fact, if they did, they soon went back to drawers, loin-cloth, or very short tight jerkin.) He must think that the *fibula* arose independently, if he does not admit that it came in from the north-west.

Again, there are the cairns in Greece, which Pausanias describes as Homer describes them. To whom does Mr. Allen attribute these typically northern cairns? To the Aegean peoples? If he says that they contain no Homeric arms, no urns, I reply: (1) That arms are very seldom buried with the Homeric dead, if at all; (2) that cairns naturally attract grave-robbers; (3) that an eminent archaeologist, as he tells me, knows no Greek cairn which has been so carefully explored as to prove a negative.

If I ask why does Homer make his Achaeans use their burial rites? he answers that Homer throws back the usages of his own day on an unknown past. He could do nothing else. But whence came the burial usages of Homer's own day? Mr. Allen says that they were 'early colonial,' say in Chios, say, 400 B.C. But how did the rites come to Chios?

The features in Homeric burials are: (1) Fire; (2) the urn of ashes; (3) the linen cloth wrapping the urn; (4) the cairn; (5) the circle of upright stones holding in the earth of the cairn; (6) the

pillar on the top of the cairn. All these are northern, and all found in *Beowulf*, and in Scottish cairns; though time has swept the column from the tomb. Now, why did early Greek colonists abandon their well-known forms of burial in a new country, and why and how did they independently invent the six details of cairn burial in Northern Europe? The chance coincidence was amazing, and no motive for the change is suggested. The idea that, in a hostile country, the colonists wished to hide the sacred ashes of their dead from the vengeful natives has occurred to minds ingenious enough to suggest that when you hide an object you conspicuously advertise the place where you have concealed it! To do so was to cry, 'Cuckolds, come dig!'

Mr. Allen's theory thus raises questions to which ingenuity cannot find a reply; at least, I cannot guess why colonists abandoned their old method of burial and adopted a thoroughly northern method. I need not enter into the question of Northern Thessaly. Tribes moving from the north-west did not need to come in a bee-line from due north of Thessaly. We have found the Homeric overlap of iron for implements, bronze for weapons, but not nearer than in Palestine; still it was a real stage in culture: Homer did not invent it. If we found cairns with the overlap in Chios or other early Asiatic colonies, then we should have found the home of Homer. But we may never find out why southerners independently evolved every detail of the northern mode of burial, to which Homer, and perhaps the prehistoric cairns of Greece seem to bear witness, so that, after all, the custom may have reached Chios (if it did reach it) from the Greek mainland.

A. LANG.

## NOTES

### MNHMEIA "ΑΔΗΑΑ.

I HAVE had occasion to work over afresh, for the purposes of Zoroastrian study, the *locus classicus* in Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride* (cc. 46 and 47) on the doctrines of the Magi. One point in it

I want to mention as conveying a possibly needed caution to students of Plutarch. The Teubner edition (*Moralia* ii. p. 519<sup>21</sup>) tells us that they pounded in a mortar *πόαν τινα Μῶλυ καλουμένην*, invoking Hades and Darkness. The mention of Moly here was extremely



interesting to me, the more so as all the writers on Persian religion showed no sign of it, reading *δρωμι* instead. Dr. Frazer referred me to the apparatus in Parthey, which I had not at hand; and my former pupil, Mr. Harold Mattingly, kindly looked up for me seven editions of Plutarch in the British Museum. The result is that Bernardakis stands in splendid isolation, having apparently been too modest to claim credit for his own really ingenious emendation in the apparatus at the foot of the page. I have not looked up the 'censura vehementissima et iniquissima' which Wilamowitz seems to have written upon Bernardakis as an editor; but even if he (or his printer) really did conjecture the highly original optative *προσπίπτειε*, as B. triumphantly asserts (*op. cit.*, p. xxi), I rather suspect that the great Hellenist had grounds for his condemnation. The positive immorality of foisting conjectures into a text without putting the MS. reading in an accessible place cannot be too severely censured. In this case ignorance of Persian subjects is responsible. I have met with others in which ignorance of Hellenistic Greek has caused the silent emending of genuine forms or locutions. The new Oxford editor of Marcus Aurelius allows us to correct him from his apparatus: the Teubner Lucian does not. (See my *Grammar of N.T. Greek*<sup>3</sup> 76.)

Since writing the above, I have heard from Prof. Wilamowitz, who kindly informs me that Dübner was the first to put *μῶλυ* in the text. So Bernardakis was not even original.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

*Didsbury College, Manchester.*

#### THE GATES OF VIRGIL'S UNDERWORLD: A REMINISCENCE OF LUCRETIUS.

It must have struck all readers of *Aeneid* VI. 273-289 that the terrifying apparitions which meet Aeneas on the threshold of the lower-world fall into two distinct classes, intentionally kept distinct by the poet.

Vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci

are the actual evils, sins, and sorrows which beset human life—

Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae;  
Pallentesque habitant Morbi, tristisque Senectus,  
Et Metus, et malesuada Fames, ac turpis Egestas,  
Terribiles visu formae—Letumque, Labosque;  
Tum consanguineus Leti Sopor, et mala mentis Gaudia,<sup>1</sup> mortiferumque adverso in limine Bellum,—

and their natural consequences, mutual enmity and the pangs of a guilty conscience, typified by the Furies—

Ferreique Eumenidum thalami, et Discordia demens  
Vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis.

But not content with these real evils, man has evolved for himself imaginary terrors, the product for the most part of his troubled dreams (somnia vana)—

Multaque praeterea variarum monstra ferarum,  
Centauri in foribus stabulant, Scyllaeque bifformes,  
Et centumgeminus Briareus, ac belua Lerna  
Horrendum stridens, flammisque armata Chimæra,  
Gorgones, Harpyiaeque, et forma tricornis umbræ.

The unreality of these terrors is emphasised by Virgil,

Et ni docta comes *tenues sine corpore vilas*  
Admoneat volitare cava sub imagine formæ  
Irruat, et frustra ferro diverberet umbras.

Now the entrance among the dreams and legendary monsters leads directly to the legendary lower-world,

*Hinc via, Tartarei quæ fert Acherontis ad undas.*

While Aeneas' exit from the lower-world is also through the region of unreal dreams:

Sunt geminae Somni portae: quarum altera fertur  
Cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris;  
Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto;  
Sed falsa ad coelum mittunt insomnia manes.  
His ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam  
Prosequitur dictis, portaque emittit eburna.

Much learning and ingenuity has been spent on the attempt to solve the problem why Aeneas, after foreseeing the future history of Rome, should leave the underworld by the gate of unreality: but it is not always remem-

<sup>1</sup> Can *mala* here have a privative sense, *mala gaudia*=sorrows (cp. *Aeneid* IV. 8 . . . male sana)? There is no other hint of joy, evil or otherwise, in the lines.

bered that he also entered by the gate of unreality.

283, 4. *quam sedem Somnia vulgo*  
*Vana tenere ferunt. . .*  
 897. *falsa ad coelum mittunt insomnia*  
*manes.*

Is it, perhaps, Virgil's way of hinting that to him this lower-world of gloom and torture was also mere legend?

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas  
 Atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum  
 Subiecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari.

So Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura*, III. 978-1023) had rationalised the stories of punishment in Tartarus into the facts of physical or moral suffering which follow sin here on earth. And in the Virgilian passage there seem to be echoes of the Lucretian, not only in thought, but in phraseology and cadence.

M. E. HIRST.

Birmingham.

ON APOLL. RHOD. I. 668 sqq.

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα φίλη τροφὸς ὦρτο  
 Πολυξώ,  
 γῆραι δὴ ῥικνοῖσιν ἐπισκάζουσα  
 πόδεσσιν,  
 670. βάκτρῳ ἔρειδομένη, περὶ δὲ μενέαν'  
 ἀγορεύσαι.  
 τῇ καὶ παρθενικαὶ πίσυρες σχεδὸν  
 ἐδρίωντο  
 ἄδμητες λευκῆσιν ἐπιχνοόουσai  
 ἐθείραις.

THE difficulty is that *λευκῆσιν ἐθείραις* are attributed to young maidens. Shaw, the 'Oxoniensis magister,' boldly translates '*flavis pubescentes crinibus*,' while Brunck goes further and substitutes in his text *ξανθῆσιν* for *λευκῆσιν*, upon which Wellauer naturally remarks 'id quomodo in *λευκῆσιν* transierit nemo facile dixerit.' This passage is discussed by Samuelsson in his *Adversaria ad Apoll. Rhod.* (1902), who refers to a passage in Strabo (p. 263) where *λευκοτριχεῖν* and *ξανθοτριχεῖν* seem to have much the same meaning. However that may be, Apollonius cannot be thought to have departed from the conventional sense of *λευκός*. Samuelsson, whose dissertation I noticed in *Classical Review* XVII. 69 sqq., comes to no definite conclusion. Others have

suggested such futilities as *λευρῆσιν* and *πλεκτήσιν*.

Modern editors, as far as I know, beginning with Wellauer (1828), have adopted the conjecture of Passow, *ἐπιχνοοῦσῃ*, but this is in reality far from being satisfactory, for (1) we do not expect any further reference to the appearance of Polyxo, to whom 669 and 670 are devoted, and the balance of sense requires a description of the *παρθενικαί*; (2) the shortening of -η in this position is only found once more in Apollonius, while that of -αι is very common.

But, after all, is any correction of the text necessary? Mr. A. S. Way translates:

'And hard by her side were there sitting  
 ancient maidens four,  
 Virgins, whose heads with the thin white hair  
 were silvered o'er.'

May not the *παρθενικαί* be 'ancient maidens'? Why should not Polyxo be attended by ladies of her own age? I admit I cannot find any passage where *παρθένος* as a substantive is used of a maiden not young. The proper meaning is simply unmarried, e.g. of the Furies in Sophocles *Ajax* (if the reading is right) *τὰς αἰέτε παρθένους*, who are not youthful, presumably, for they are called 'old girls' (*παλαιαὶ παῖδες*) elsewhere. The words *χνοάω* and *χνοάζω* are used of youthful people except in Sophocles *χνοάζων ἄρτι λευκανθὲς κάρα* which may support *ἐπιχνοόουσai* here. I put forward my opinion rather tentatively, because if such a use of *παρθενικαί* were recognised, there would have been no need to alter the reading.

R. C. SEATON.

Reigate.

ON HORACE, *CARM.* 4. 5. 1.

IN the December number of *C.R.* two critics oppose my view that '*Divis orte bonis*' = 'sprung from benignant gods.' Such rendering is said to ignore the context, which requires a compliment and a direct reference to the subject of the ode. I reply that the attribution of divine origin is clearly shown to be complimentary by such phrases as '*orte Saturno*' and '*nate dea*,' while the

epithet 'bonis' makes the compliment especially marked; also that there is a direct reference to the subject of the ode. Moreover, the parallel of the context between 4. 5. 1. and 1. 12. 49-50 is so close as strongly to support my argument. Each is an encomium to Augustus; in each he is compared to a heavenly constellation diffusing light; in 1. 12 he is addressed as 'Gentis humanae pater atque custos Orte Saturno,' in 4. 5 as 'Divis Orte bonis, optime Romulae Custos gentis.' One or two instances can no doubt be found where 'ortus' stands alone as

= 'natus.' But normally 'ortus' = 'sprung from,' and requires an Ablative of Origin or some equivalent. L. and S. give 33 examples (including 7 from Horace) of 'ortus' in this sense followed by an Ablative construction, not one of its absolute use; while the example quoted against my case, viz., 'per dedecus ortum' in reality supports it, as this phrase = 'sprung from shame.' The substance, the context and the grammatical form all seem in favour of my view.

A. SLOMAN.

*The Vicarage, Godmanchester.*

## REVIEWS

### EINLEITUNG IN DIE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT.

*Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft.*  
Herausgegeben von ALFRED GERCKE  
und EDUARD NORDEN. 3 Vols.  
(I. xii + 588; II., viii + 432; III., viii  
+ 444). Leipsic and Berlin: B. G.  
Teubner, 1910-12. M. 26.

THE *Introduction to the Study of the Classics*, projected by the publisher to whom scholars owe so great a debt, written under the direction of Dr. Gercke and Dr. Norden by an admirable selection of specialists, has now reached its conclusion. The two first volumes were published at the end of 1910, and a second edition is already in preparation; the third volume has just appeared. The book has some fourteen hundred closely-printed pages, but the editors warn us that there are gaps in the subjects treated, that 'completeness would have been the death of their undertaking.' Among the sacrifices that have been made may be noted Geography as well as Industry, Trade, Slavery, and other subjects connected with the ordinary life of the ancients. While we may extend our sympathy to the Editors in their resolve to keep the work within strict limits of space, we may regret that the economy, public and private, of the Greeks and Romans could not be included. It is a subject in which knowledge is rapidly increasing, economic factors help the interpretation of history, and as there

are few text-books on the subject, a summary treatment of it would be especially useful. We may also regret that the use of the book for purposes of reference is not facilitated by a fuller and more detailed index.

For the preparation of a work, encyclopaedic in character, scientific in method, and yet severely restricted in length, German scholars have alike special advantages and special aptitudes. So much activity is displayed by the professors at the many German Universities, that independent works and learned periodicals cover every branch of Classical Study; and the German scholar has a power of selecting and digesting the material at his hand.

It will be best to give some account of the plan of the book, and of the different sections. The chapters have a bibliographical value, and thus further research is facilitated. There are adequate references to the literature, and, as is natural, the authors cited are mostly German, rarely French or English. Most of the chapters are followed by sections setting forth sources and materials of knowledge, and discussing particular problems. These sections are not the least valuable part of the book. In general the object of the writers seems to be to give results and points of view, and details come in as illustrations.

The encyclopaedic treatment does not exclude the personal equation, and the authors have been left free, for the most part, to express their own views, whether or not they conflict with the views expressed elsewhere in the book. This inevitably leads to some contradictions and some overlappings. Thus Dr. Kretschmer and Dr. Lehmann-Haupt argue that the Etruscans came to Italy by sea from the East, while Dr. Beloch as positively rejects this conclusion. There are similar differences on the ethnology of the Macedonians and on the identity of the Oxyrhynchus historian. There are other instances of repetition and divergency, but absolute uniformity could not have been attained without a sacrifice of freshness and individuality of treatment.

The book opens with a long discussion of *Methodik* by Dr. Gercke. The young student is properly warned against beginning the book with this chapter, for he might be daunted by its solidity. It contains much that is of interest on the materials and the methods of Classical Study, and Dr. Gercke covers a wide field with a sure knowledge; but the reflexion is suggested to the less methodical English mind that the metaphysics of scholarship, the discussion of the processes, inductive and deductive, that are employed, the partition of the relative spheres of imagination and logic, need not have been treated with such fulness. Further, while the chapter deals with the 'ancient book,' and with palaeography and interpretation, which are not treated elsewhere, a discussion of the methods applied in historical and archaeological investigation and in the study of language anticipates and is to some extent repeated in later chapters.

Dr. Kretschmer covers much ground in a small compass, and, in spite of the compression of his material, gives an account of the problems of language that is interesting and useful. His discussion of the Greek dialects sets clearly before the reader conclusions of great value for the ethnology of Greece. This is followed by the development of the *κοινή* and of the literary language. The history of Latin is treated in a similar way, and the influence of Etruscan is

demonstrated not only in borrowed words, but in the Roman system of names. A brief section on grammar follows. Metre is treated by Dr. Bickel, Greek Poetry by Dr. Bethe, Greek Prose by Dr. Wendland, and Roman Literature by Dr. Norden. The development of literary forms is traced, and the ancient authors are briefly characterised, but for the most part detail is avoided. Among the problems discussed at greater length is that of the Greek theatre. Dr. Bethe argues for a gradual development of the mechanical arrangements of the stage, as he did in the book he published some years ago.

In the second volume Dr. Pernice discusses the Private Life of the Greeks and Romans, limiting himself to the House, Dress, and the ceremonies connected with Marriage, Birth, and Death. Dr. Winter prefixes a short and useful history of Archaeological Research to his chapter on Greek Art. Roman Art is not treated. Dr. Wide's survey of Greek and Roman Religion is exceedingly valuable as a summary of results and opinions. He distinguishes clearly the different elements in Greek Religion and traces the development from primitive and savage cults to the establishment of the Olympian Pantheon: under Roman Religion he treats separately the native and the foreign deities. Dr. Gercke is responsible for the History of Philosophy, and Dr. Heiberg for that of the Exact Sciences and Medicine. It is due to the plan of the work that while the science of medicine is discussed in its different stages there is no account of medical practice.

The third volume is devoted to History and Antiquities: Greek History is divided between Dr. Lehmann-Haupt and Dr. Beloch, Roman History between Dr. Beloch and Dr. Kornemann, while Dr. Keil treats of Greek, and Dr. Neumann of Roman Political Antiquities.

English teachers may congratulate themselves that Dr. Lehmann-Haupt has become their colleague, and in his admirable chapter on Greek History to the battle of Chaeronea they may recognise his profound knowledge, his sound judgment, and his powers of exposition. He is not concerned to



give a narrative of the historical events: he selects the chief moments of Greek History for discussion. Some of the more important problems he considers at length in the appendix to his chapter, and in many cases he is able to refer for a fuller treatment to his own studies published in *Klio*. To the earliest period he applies the archaeological and ethnological evidence, which he interprets with breadth and sanity of view. It is gratifying to find that he accepts the principle that 'the traditions kept up by a people concerning their prehistoric past, even if they are in legendary form, are to be accepted as being in kernel historic, until they are proved otherwise.' Certain points of interest may be noted. He inclines on the whole to accept the constitution of Draco in Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, and the introduction of the lot by Solon, and he has much that is illuminating to say respecting the purpose and effect of Solon's laws.

Dr. Beloch has written on the Hellenistic period, to the knowledge of

which he has contributed so much that is valuable in his larger Greek History. He gives a brief and clear abstract of the course of events rather than a discussion of particular problems. It is characteristic of his work that he throws light and lays stress on economic factors (as, for example, on the distress of landed proprietors owing to the wars fought out in the Peloponnesus) and on the development of learning and science in the Alexandrian age.

In his Roman History he offers a contrast to Dr. Lehmann-Haupt in almost dismissing the legendary history of the origin of Rome and the kingly period. On the other hand, he emphasises the importance of Greek influence on the early state. For the rest he gives a straightforward narrative of the history of the Republic, as does Dr. Kornemann of that of the Empire.

Enough has been said to show that the book is a solid and valuable aid to the study of the Classics, well planned and well executed.

LEONARD WHIBLEY.

*Pembroke College, Cambridge.*

#### STAAT UND GESELLSCHAFT DER GRIECHEN UND RÖMER.

*Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer.* Von U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF und B. NIESE (Teil II., Abt. iv. 1 of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*). 1 Vol. Pp. vi+280. Berlin and Leipsic: B. G. Teubner, 1910. M. 8.

To another encyclopaedic work, which proceeds from the same publisher, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Dr. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Dr. Niese contribute *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer*. Dr. Wilamowitz is fortunately not to be confined within the bonds of an encyclopædia. While Dr. Niese gave a brief chronicle and abstract of Roman History from its origins to the ends of the Western Empire in some 57 pages, Dr. Wilamowitz, who takes about 200 pages for his share, treats his subject very differently. His purpose is not to record the course of events, but to depict the political and social conditions that pre-

vailed at different epochs. To the history of Hellenic and Hellenistic civilisation is prefixed a survey of the origins of the Greek race and the gradual evolution of historical states. The materials for the *Kulturgeschichte* of the Greeks are meagre and incomplete: they must be gleaned from many fields, and though no references are given it is obvious how great has been the author's diligence in studying not only the literature but the inscriptions and products of art.

If the *Kultur der Gegenwart* is intended for the general reader in Germany, he will need a considerable knowledge of Greek History properly to appreciate this volume. For Dr. Wilamowitz is often less concerned to inform the ignorant than to deny current theories or to propound apparent paradoxes, which seem all the more dogmatic that the evidence on which they are based is not presented. The earliest section of his work, dealing with the prehistoric age, is perhaps less valuable and con-



vincing than the rest. Dr. Wilamowitz does not seem so sure of his ground in dealing with ethnology, and the small respect he shows to the myths makes many of his conclusions speculative. In the interpretation of the *Iliad* he regards 'conscious archaism' by the poet as possible: parts of the *Odyssey* are 'scarcely older than Solon.' The old legend of the Dorian invasion is 'too rational not to be an invention,' and it is suggested that the Dorians probably spread from Crete to the Peloponnesus.

Among theories which challenge current opinion may be mentioned the emphatic assertion (supported by a close argument) that there was not originally 'a sovereign patriarchal kingship' in Greece, and the denial that the Greek state was a city-state. The 'Council' is a comparatively late development, and 'the constitution stands in no necessary relation to economic conditions.' Why it is asserted (in the face of Aristotle. *Æth. pol.* 43.5), that ostracism 'already out of use was formally abolished by the restored democracy after the fall of the Empire,' I do not understand.

While passages like most of the foregoing stimulate thought without always carrying conviction, there are many others in which the author shows his power of summarising much material in an effective phrase, of realising vividly the conditions of ancient life, of describing them with an almost poetic eloquence. Thus he gives a description of life at Sparta, which makes it possible to conceive of the Spartiates as human beings: there is a companion picture of the life of democratic Athens,

simple, healthy, and natural. And the same skill is shown in piecing together a mosaic of the civic and social conditions of Hellenism.

The author combines observation and imagination, and we are constantly struck by the new meaning given to a familiar fact or by the phrase which illuminates a commonplace. A few instances may be cited. 'The Spartiates diminished in number, so that the ruling class ceased to be an army and became merely an "Offizierkorps."' 'Attic Tragedy and the sculptors of the Parthenon discovered women.' 'The great advance (of the Athenian democracy) is that it made the individual independent.' 'Plato's state was more a school than a state.' Dr. Wilamowitz seems to enter into the mind of the Greek when in talking of the admission of the Samians to Athenian citizenship he says that 'such a union of states would imply an impossible monotheism.'

Dr. Wilamowitz has, in a brief compass, produced a commentary which throws great light on Greek life and culture. He is always interesting, as he is himself interested in every fresh use of his material: while his conclusions are stated dogmatically it is obvious that they are based on wide reading, deep knowledge and researches on every field of Classical life. Is it too much to hope that he will give a fuller statement of these studies of the Greek state and society, with a longer discussion of the problems and a citation and estimate of the evidence?

LEONARD WHIBLEY.

*Pembroke College, Cambridge.*

## THE POETICS OF ARISTOTLE.

*The Poetics of Aristotle.* By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, Laudian Professor of Arabic, Oxford. Pp. xi + 336. Hodder and Stoughton, 1911. 10s. 6d.

TWENTY years ago Professor Margoliouth earned our gratitude by making the Arabic version of the *Poetics* accessible in a Latin translation to the ordinary scholar. His new volume contains that and a great deal more. Begin-

ning with a statement at some length of what he calls the 'esoteric style' of the *Poetics* and an examination in the light of this conception of various particular passages, he goes on to discuss the MSS., and with them again the reading and meaning of other passages. There follows an English translation with a considerable commentary, and then a Greek text with full critical notes and with the Latin translation from the

Arabic on the page opposite; finally a glossary, briefly interpreting all the more important words.

The book shows all and more than all the learning we expect from Professor Margoliouth. Few, if any, Greek scholars have his large Oriental knowledge, and for that alone we should be thankful to him. But he is also, as he proves over and over again, extremely well read in all parts of the Aristotelian writings, and he seems equally familiar with the books, especially German, of the last thirty or forty years dealing with such literary and aesthetic questions as naturally arise in connexion with the *Poetics*. His commentary in particular, which differs very widely in character from the usual notes on a classical text, evinces an extraordinarily wide range of reading and contains much of great interest from many sources on many *Poetics* matters. Few books that issue from the press show anything like so much reading and thinking.

I wish I could stop here. But in spite of it all any one who does not allow himself to be carried away by great erudition and ability must read the book with wonder and end it with disappointment. With the utmost respect for the author we find in it to our regret that the strength of his fancy is as great as his knowledge and often greater than his judgment. If we are familiar with the *Poetics*, we almost fail to recognise a number of passages as they emerge from his exposition. We rub our eyes as we read, and can hardly believe such strange and perverse interpretations to be seriously meant. There is always much ingenuity in them and much learning behind them, but constantly they are as unconvincing as they are new. Let us postpone the general question of esoteric style, on which he lays especial stress, and look at his treatment of some particular passages.

To a certain extent this rests on a view of the MS. authority for the text different from the ordinary. He seeks to show not only that the Arabic version, second or third hand though it be, is of considerable value, a good deal more than is allowed by such an editor as

Professor Bywater, but also that the secondary Greek MSS. are not to be dismissed in a summary way as mere *apographa* of the Paris *codex*. He gives, I think, good reasons for attributing a more independent character to some of them than has recently been thought, though probably this will make no great difference to the ordinary text. Here again it ought to be said that he has laboured with extreme assiduity and care in the collation of MSS., and has put into his critical notes a mass of textual information which will be of interest to scholars. But the independence of this or that MS. is one thing and its intrinsic merit another, and even with regard to A<sup>c</sup>, the famous Paris MS., itself we must distinguish its relative from its absolute weight. He carries respect for MSS. very far indeed, and would much rather put some quite forced and unsatisfactory interpretation upon a passage than make a small change in it which gives excellent sense. So faithful to MS. tradition is he now that he has entirely suppressed a former emendation of his own, which the poetical system of Aristotle undoubtedly requires and which is most certainly right. In Chapter III. Aristotle says that in one way Sophocles is an 'imitator' of the same kind as Homer, in respect that is of the men they represent; in another way of the same kind as Aristophanes: *πράττοντας γὰρ μιμοῦνται καὶ δρῶντας ἀμφω*. Now the fact that Sophocles and Aristophanes both show men *πράττοντας καὶ δρῶντας* does not distinguish them from Homer or any other poet, for according to Aristotle all poetical imitation whatever is a representation of this. What does distinguish them is their completely dramatic character, that is that they represent by action, by themselves acting as he puts it, identifying author and actor: in other words *πράττοντες καὶ δρῶντες*, nominative, not accusative. Cf. elsewhere *πράττουσι, ἐν τῷ πράττειν μίμησις, δρῶντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας*. Yet Professor Margoliouth, who was himself the first to point this out, has now gone back into voluntary bondage to the MSS.

On this passage he has the support of other editors, but on very many he

differs from them all in a surprising way. In 24. 8 the MSS. say that τὸ ἀνάλογον is especially admissible in epic. This is now always altered to τὸ ἄλογον, *the improbable*; but he keeps ἀνάλογον and renders it 'poetical justice,' a most unlikely sense, supported by an extraordinary misinterpretation of the example given from Homer. In 22. 7, instead of 'the insertion of ordinary forms (of words) in the verse' (μέτρον) we have 'putting the nouns into the centre,' because one MS. has κέντρον; and this is explained as 'making them the fixed element to which the metre must be accommodated'—e.g., beginning a hexameter with the tribrach of ὁλομένην. In 2. 4, where γὰς is generally allowed to be unintelligible and corrupt, he maintains it, and, taking ὁμοίους from one inferior MS. instead of ὁμοίως, understands that 'Earths and Cyclopes have been represented like men' and that 'the likeness between the Earth and ourselves probably lies in the former being in the middle.' Why a dithyrambic poet should write of earths in the plural he does not explain. In 16. 4 the ordinary ἐξήν γὰρ ἂν ἔνια καὶ ἐνέγκειν found in A<sup>c</sup> and others is turned into ἐξήν γὰρ ἂν ἔννοϊαν ἐνέχειν, because ἔννοϊαν or ἔνοϊαν appears in two MSS. and the Arabic points to it. ἔννοϊαν ἔχειν is of course good enough Greek, but ἐνέχω (active and transitive) is a word unknown not only to Aristotle, but to almost all our Greek writers. It is cited only from Herodotus (χόλον ἐνέχειν), and we may be reasonably certain that Aristotle never used any such phrase. In 4. 11 the sentence with the well-known αὐτό τε καθ' αὐτό κρίνεται is rendered (taking εἶναι from the *apographa* for A<sup>c</sup>'s ἡ ναί) 'consideration whether etc. is in the abstract a distinct matter from the same question with reference to audiences.' This is obtained by taking κρίνω in the sense of *distinguish*, so that the words mean literally 'is distinguished so as to be another matter.' Apart from the strangeness of this, it involves making αὐτό καθ' αὐτό refer to ἐπισκοπεῖν, whereas it is clear that it must refer to παραφθία. In 18. 2 οὗς is not indeed defended; the οἰκείον of one MS. (another has ὁμαλόν) is taken for it. Then arises

the question what is τὸ οἰκείον or what is 'an appropriate tragedy.' It is that tragedy 'in which the language predominates'—i.e., in which the diction is the chief feature. If we ask why this should be styled appropriate, we are told 'the language, as we learn from the *Rhetoric* iii. 7, should be *appropriate* to the characters and situations; hence the linguistic tragedy is called the appropriate tragedy—i.e., the tragedy of appropriate expression.' In the same context we find 'since it is the function of Intelligence to rouse the emotions (§ 19), the tragedy wherein the Intelligence predominates is called the emotional tragedy.' I believe that παθητική does not even mean *emotional* here, though in this Professor Margoliouth has support from others, but that it refers to bodily suffering, the πάθος of 11. 6. But in any case what use of words could be more unnatural than to call a tragedy emotional because it is intellectual and we sometimes use our intellects to consider how we may best arouse emotion in others? In 17. 1 certainly we do not know exactly under what circumstances Amphiarus ἐξ ἱεροῦ ἀνῆλθαι, but we may be tolerably confident that the words do not refer to any 'resurrection out of a temple.' The poet's failure, adds Professor Margoliouth, was due to his forgetting that, if Amphiarus was divine and had a temple, he should have come down to it, not up. 9. 9 οἷα ἂν εἰκὸς γενέσθαι καὶ δυνατὰ γενέσθαι is rendered 'such as potentialities would with moral certainty be.' διηγηματικὴ μίμησις (24. 5) is 'narrative imagery.' 23. 1 ὁμοίας ἱστορίας τὰς συνηθεῖς is kept as in the MSS. and translated 'monotonous chronicles of the familiar kind.' 6. 9 Aristotle speaks of tragedy as a picture of εὐδαιμονία. From the oddness of this and the fact that κακοδαιμονία is mentioned just afterwards Vahlen plausibly added the latter word to the former, so that they give a pair of possibilities in human life. The editor keeps the former only and explains it by the ingenious but most perverse equation, founded on the *Ethics*, πρᾶξις σπουδαία καὶ τελεία = ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν = εὐδαιμονία, as though the πρᾶξις σπουδαία of tragedy was a good action. He

contends indeed that *σπουδαῖος* must signify heroic, that is preeminent, excellence, and at the same time that, as this is only possible in a king or other person of the highest rank, *σπουδαῖος* includes high rank in its meaning.

A suggestion of some interest is made on the subject of the *κάθαρσις*. Professor Margoliouth connects this with the account of the *μελαγχολικοί* in *Problems* 30. 1, where it is shown that excess of cold or heat in 'the black bile' produces certain mental states, fear among others, and he argues that the *κάθαρσις* of tragedy is a qualitative change in which an internal chill (coldness of bile, producing despondency, fear, etc.) is cured by the operation of an external one, the chill struck into us by the contents of the play, or an internal heat by an external in the same way. The Bernaysian theory, he thinks, is much less satisfactory. On this I venture to make one or two remarks. First his explanation is surely in essence identical with that of Bernays, that we rid ourselves of a feeling by indulging it. To call the chill or heat external is a mere way of speaking; it is as much a state of feeling in ourselves as any other. Most feeling has an external cause to start with. If a man in low spirits goes to see a tragedy, either simply because he likes it or because from experience he hopes to get relieved by it, he assuredly 'indulges' a feeling. Again, if I read the *Problems* rightly, fear is produced by coldness, pity by heat, of the black bile, just as the writer (Aristotle or not) points out that the heat of drink makes some men maudlin or 'prone to pity' (*ἐλεήμονας*). Tragedy then, which commonly inspires pity and fear together, should produce two opposite results at the same time, cold and heat, which might be expected roughly to cancel one another. The theory is also still open to such objections as I mentioned in this *Review* xxiv. 89. Whatever may be the case with this or that individual, no one could well describe the main body of spectators as suffering, at the time when they repair to the theatre, from an accumulation in their minds of pity and fear, of which the tragedy presently disburdens them. It is with the healthy

crowd, the ordinary spectator, that dramatic theory must deal, not with the pathology of the single abnormal man.

Professor Margoliouth suggests also a new derivation for *tragic* and *tragedy*, connecting them with *τραγίζειν*, which expresses a 'crack' in the voice, the pitch of which at puberty is called by Aristotle *ἀνώματος*, a word applied too in the *Problems* to a particular tragic method of utterance or delivery, with the remark added that *τὸ ἀνώμαλον* is *παθητικόν* and *γνώδες*.

It remains to mention a fundamental idea of Professor Margoliouth's, from which some of the odd explanations above noticed are more or less derived. He revives the old theory of esoteric teaching on Aristotle's part. He believes, that is, that Aristotle not merely lectured or wrote for the select few in a deeper and generally more difficult way than that in which he addressed himself to the larger number, but that he deliberately and carefully composed some of his works—how many and exactly which does not appear—in such a way as to make them unintelligible to the ordinary reader. Professor Margoliouth assigns, I think, no reason for this strange proceeding; presumably it would be the desire not to make a good thing too common; but he is quite certain this was Aristotle's method. 'The purpose . . . is to be understood only by members of his school' and again 'persons who accepted his system and learned his works by heart,' rather an arduous task. This leads to such consequences as 'that the author by preference uses a word in different senses in the same paragraph or sentence.' It was meant then that the student should begin by knowing in a sense all the (esoteric ?) books, that is all Aristotle's philosophy, and then that he should be shown how to understand them either by the philosopher himself or by some accredited Aristotelian. He might think he understood some seemingly simple dictum, but the key to it was usually another dictum in some quite different work, and only a specially trained person would ever perceive the connexion. The editor illustrates this by Oriental parallels. But are not Oriental parallels misleading here?



Such a game of mystery belongs much more to the East than to Athens; and, if to Athens at all, though it is not at all likely to be true of either, we could more readily believe it of Plato than of Aristotle. Indeed in the second and seventh of the so-called Platonic letters there are distinct intimations of the kind, but the writer of the metaphysical rigmarole in the seventh was a very different person from Plato himself. As to Aristotle, I cannot but think that what Professor Margoliouth affirms is either a familiar fact or something improbable in the extreme. Everyone knows that he had a system at once wide and minute; the parts of it were of course connected with and partly to be explained by one another; and no doubt a trained Aristotelian would be of great use to one less well informed, as

Professor Margoliouth himself, without any esoteric information and yet penetrating Aristotle's disguises, sets out to be. If this were all that was meant, it would but be insisting on what is certainly true and universally allowed. But what I have quoted and other things too seem to show that more than this is meant. The stress laid on secrecy, on the intention not to be understood, on the erection of a more than Lucilian *vallum* between philosopher and public, on Oriental occultism, goes much beyond any such acknowledged fact. It is a new or rather an old thesis which Professor Margoliouth will find some difficulty now in getting Aristotelians to accept. Aristotle may have been austere; he was not absurd.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### KLOTZ'S CÄSARSTUDIEN.

*Cäsarstudien nebst einer Analyse der Strabonischen Beschreibung von Gallien und Britannien.* By ALFRED KLOTZ. 8vo. Pp. vi+267. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 6.

PROFESSOR KLOTZ is already known to Caesarian scholars by a valuable paper on the pedigree and correlation of the best MSS. of the Commentaries, which appeared in the *Rheinisches Museum* of 1909 (pp. 224-34). His *Cäsarstudien* comprise various articles, grouped under three heads—geographical, relating to Hirtius, and relating to Caesar's grammar and style. In Part I., after a chapter devoted to the literary character of the *Bellum Gallicum* and the *Bellum civile*, he tries to prove that certain geographical passages in the former—notably i. 1. 5-7; iv. 10; v. 12-14, and vi. 25-8—were not written by Caesar. Then follow a chapter in which Klotz analyses Strabo's description of Gaul and Britain, and another, in which he endeavours to trace the alleged interpolations to their source. In Part II. he studies the personality of Hirtius, shows that in describing Caesar's last Gallic campaign his diction was non-military, and attempts to demonstrate that he was the author of the *Bellum*

*Alexandrinum*. In Part III. he investigates Caesar's use of proper names and of the words *milia passuum* and *pedes, sese* and *se*. Finally he examines a considerable number of passages in which the text is doubtful, and offers emendations or adopts readings which differ from those of Meusel.

Klotz's treatment of the geographical passages which he regards as interpolated is most interesting and important: with one or two exceptions<sup>1</sup> he arrives independently at the same results as Meusel, who discussed these very passages in the *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* of 1910. In the new edition of *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (pp. 206, 394 n. 6, 439, 692 n. 2, 851) I have already noticed the arguments of both. Here I need only say that they have made out on the whole a very strong case. The famous chapter (iv. 10), for instance, which describes the Meuse and the Rhine, is almost certainly spurious. I am not yet, however, quite convinced that the description of Britain (v. 12-14) is the work of an interpolator. Klotz argues, as

<sup>1</sup> In *B.G.* i. 6, 1 Klotz follows Mommsen in deleting *inter montem Iuram et flumen Rhodanum*, which Meusel rightly retains. See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 1911, p. 613, n. 2.



other critics have done, that it breaks the connexion of the narrative, and that several expressions in the three chapters could not have been used by Caesar. Undoubtedly the description interrupts the story; but so does the digression on the manners and customs of the Gauls and Germans (vi. 11-24), the authenticity of which is indisputable. Linguistic arguments in inquiries of this sort should be used with great caution; and some of Klotz's conclusions seem to me questionable. He insists that in v. 13, 3 Caesar would have written not *non nulli*, but *quidam*; but anyone who consults Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum* (ii. 809 seq.) will, I think, call this objection over-subtle. *Creberrima* (aedificia) in 12, 3 is, says Klotz, very 'flat': 'Das wichtige ist, dass *creberrimus* nichts weiter ist als *plurimus*.' I cannot agree: *creberrima aedificia* means 'homesteads are met with at every turn.' Klotz concludes that the 'Pseudo-Caesar' used Timagenes as an authority, and that for much of the description the original source was Posidonius. But there is no evidence that Posidonius was ever in Britain (see my *Ancient Britain*, p. 499, n. 2); and the mention of iron 'currency-bars' (*taleis ferreis*), numerous hoards of which have been discovered, and of water-clocks,<sup>1</sup> must have come from an eye-witness. I would fain believe that he was Caesar or one of Caesar's informants. Moreover, if v. 12-14 were interpolated, the words (*Cantium*) *quod esse ad mare supra demonstrauimus* (v. 22, § 1), which evidently refer to 14, § 1, must also be bracketed. But then Klotz must admit that Caesar said nothing to show where *Cantium* was; and *Cantium, quibus regionibus IIII reges praeerant*, seems rather harsh, whereas the harshness would be softened by the intervening words, *quod esse . . . demonstrauimus*. Still, if Meusel and Klotz have not proved that the three chapters are spurious, they have given weighty reasons for suspecting their authenticity.

<sup>1</sup> 'Hier,' says Klotz (p. 146), 'gibt sich der Verfasser als einen Teilnehmer an der Expedition Cäsars aus; es liegt also bewusste Fälschung vor.' Certainly—if the writer was not Caesar.

Klotz's essay on the authorship of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* approaches as near to demonstration as the nature of the case will allow. Suetonius, as everybody knows, remarked that the matter was uncertain, some critics being in favour of Hirtius, others of Oppius. Nipperdey proved that the writer was not Oppius; and Asinius Pollio has no longer any advocates. Klotz, by an exhaustive comparison of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* with the *Eighth Commentary*, shows that both abound with expressions which would not have been used by a soldier; that between the two books there are (as I have myself often noticed) close resemblances and even coincidences in style and language; that two passages in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (3, 1 and 19, 6) in which the author apparently writes as an eye-witness, whereas Hirtius (*B.G.*, viii. Praef., 8) says that he was not present in the war, may be explained by assuming that he clumsily incorporated the report of an eye-witness in his own narrative; and that if there are noticeable linguistic differences between the books, differences not less striking might be pointed out between any two speeches of Cicero, while the events described in the *Eighth Commentary* were sufficiently unlike those described in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* to account for the absence in the latter of various words which occur in the former.

After an elaborate examination of relevant passages Klotz concludes that Caesar used *sese* instead of *se* only in clauses in which he intended to emphasize the pronoun. There is some truth in this; but Klotz admits that several instances of *sese* (*B.G.*, i. 34, 1; iv. 11, 4; v. 27, 11; 41, 1; *B.C.*, ii. 17, 2) cannot on this principle be explained; and I am inclined to suspect that Caesar was not so rigidly consistent as Klotz believes.

In several of the passages which Klotz examines he has definitively settled the question whether the reading of *a* or of *ſ* should be preferred. Some of his emendations also are very ingenious; and a few—for example, those of i. 24, 2; ii. 18, 2; iv. 19, 4; v. 28, 4;

and v. 53, 3—ought, I think, to be received into the text.<sup>1</sup> Others seem to me unnecessary; and the arguments by which he defends the MS. reading in iv. 29, 2—(ita uno tempore et) *longas naves, quibus Caesar exercitum transportandum curaverat quasque in aridum subduxerat, aestus complebat, et onerarias, quae ad ancoras erant deligatae, tempestas adflictabat*—are radically unsound. The difficulty, I need hardly point out, is that no troops, so far as we know, had been carried in the galleys, except artillerymen, archers, and slingers (iv. 25, 1). Vielhaber deleted *quibus . . . curaverat*, and was therefore compelled to substitute *quas Caesar* for *quasque*. Meusel, who in his critical edition followed Vielhaber, afterwards adopted the conjecture of Mommsen, who only deleted *longas* and *onerarias*. Klotz observes that the only defender of the MS. reading is Heller, who explains *exercitum* as meaning 'marines' (*ἐπιβάται*). Klotz points out, however, that, as we learn from *Bellum Africanum*, 2, 1, galleys were [sometimes] used for the transport of legions; and he adds that in *B.G.*, iv. 22, 3 (*navibus circiter LXXX onerariis coactis contractisque, quot satis esse ad duas transportandas legiones existimabat, quod praeterea navium longarum habebat quaestori, legatis praefectisque distribuit*) the words *contractisque* have been unnecessarily bracketed, and that *contractisque . . . existimabat* refers to galleys, as we may infer from the following words—*quod praeterea navium longarum habebat*, etc. Accordingly he concludes that in 29, 2 *exercitum* denotes Caesar's two legions, and that the eighty transports (*navibus circiter LXXX onerariis*) mentioned in 22, 3 served only to convey the cavalry and stores. This view, he maintains, is confirmed by Caesar's description of his first landing in Britain, which evidently implies that the legionaries jumped into the sea from the galleys [1]. Klotz would hardly have com-

mitted himself to this singular misinterpretation if he had reflected that eighty transports would have been several times too many for the conveyance of the cavalry and stores, and if he had remembered that Caesar expressly says (iv. 22, 4; 28, 1) that the cavalry were conveyed in eighteen transports, which were distinct from the eighty, and (iv. 36, 4; 37, 1) that transports were used for carrying legionaries. I will not waste time in proving that the legionaries jumped down from the transports<sup>2</sup>; for hardly anyone except Klotz has ever failed to see that they did.

Mommsen's emendation must be rejected, because it implies that the transports were beached and that the galleys rode at anchor; whereas it is evident and is implied both in iv. 24, 2 and in v. 1, 2 that the transports used in the first expedition were too large to be beached, and that the galleys, which drew less water, were not. May we suppose that Caesar wrote (ita uno tempore et) *longas naves, quas Caesar in aridum subduxerat, aestus complebat, et onerarias, quibus exercitum transportandum curaverat quaeque ad ancoras erant deligatae, tempestas adflictabat*? Besides the alteration of *quasque* into *quas Caesar*, this conjecture, of which I am not at all enamoured, only involves a transposition such as Klotz has, rightly I think, postulated in i. 24, 2: if it will not do, I fear that we must follow Vielhaber.

Want of space has forced me to leave much unsaid; so I will only advise those who may be interested in the questions which Klotz discusses to read the searching, candid, and scrupulously fair review which Meusel has contributed to the *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* of 1910 (pp. 104-114). On the whole *Cäsarstudien* is a very good book, which no student of the *Commentaries* can afford to neglect.

T. RICE HOLMES.

<sup>1</sup> In iv. 19, 4, however, Meusel has shown that after *p(opuli) Ro(mani)* Klotz should have inserted *profectum* rather than *factum*.

<sup>2</sup> See my *Ancient Britain*, p. 673.

## ANCIENT INTERNATIONAL LAW.

*The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome.* By COLEMAN PHILLIPSON, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 2 vols. Pp. xxiv + 419, xvi + 421. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911. 21s. net.

IT has been an all too usual commonplace with writers on international law that their science was in its origin an independent creation, springing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from the native inspiration of Gentilis, Ayala, Grotius, and similar writers. An outcome of this theory has been the refusal to credit the Ancients with either knowledge of or interest in the subject. Vergé declares that 'The ancient world had not grasped the fundamental notion of the law of nations,' and Guizot states 'La force présidait seule à leurs rapports; le droit des gens n'existait pas. À peine les plus grands esprits de l'Antiquité, Aristote et Cicéron, en ont-ils conçu quelque idée.' The furthest concession has been to credit the Greeks with the simplest rudiments of a species of international good feeling, expressed in the loose phrase τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμιμα, and to allow to the Romans the conception of a nebulous *ius fetiale*, which, but for the expansion of the Empire, might have been found to contain the germ of a future law of nations. It is difficult to understand why research and reflection should not hitherto have sufficed to dispel this view. It is obvious that the whole basis of international law must of necessity be found in the conception of 'the comity of nations,' to which the recognition of the existence of independent sovereign states—the notion of territorial sovereignty, in short—must serve as an indispensable preliminary. That both these ideas were familiar to the Ancients is easily apparent. The Digest contains a sufficiently accurate definition of a 'sovereign state': '*Liber . . . populus est, qui nullius alterius populi potestati est subiectus*' (Dig. xlix. 15. 7. 1).

Cicero (*De Rep.* i. 25) speaks of '*coetus multitudinis juris consensu et utilitatis commune consociatus*.' In the light of this conception of sovereign states, possessing a juridical personality, an individuality apart from the persons who compose their population, we have arrived at a position where clearly something more than the mere rudiments of an international law is understood. The conception is, indeed, at once the beginning and the end of the modern law of nations.

Among both Greeks and Romans only sovereign states were held capable of commissioning ambassadors—a precept of law which at once explains the harsh answer of the proconsul Publius to the Aeginetan citizens in 208 B.C.: ὅτε ἦσαν αὐτῶν κύριοι, τότε δεῖν διαπρεσβεύεσθαι . . . μὴ νῦν δούλους γεγονότας. The law relating to ambassadors and their reception indeed seems, from indications in various ancient writers, to have reached a very high pitch of development on lines very closely akin to those of modern times. Thus the principle of neutrality and extraterritoriality as relating to envoys appears to have been an accepted precept among ancient people, if the following anecdote which Dr. Phillipson quotes from Plutarch's *Life of Camillus* is to be taken as genuinely dating from the time to which the writer refers it: 'In 390 B.C. the Senonian Gauls, under their leader Brennus, were marching against Clusium, when the Romans, foreboding the danger, despatched as envoys three distinguished members of the Fabian gens to arrest their advance by means of negotiation. The Gauls, however, rejected the overtures made to them and pursued their attack. So that fate, now pressing hard on the Roman city, as Livy expresses it, the ambassadors, contrary to the law of nations, took up arms to assist the Etruscans in their defence. . . . Brennus recognised Quintus Ambustus, one of the sons of Fabius Ambustus, as he slew a Gaulish warrior, and (according to the statement of Plutarch) called the gods to witness his violation of the

common law of all nations, in coming to them as an ambassador and fighting against them as an enemy—ὡς δ' ἐπικρατήσας τῇ μάχῃ καὶ καταβαλὼν, ἐσκύλευε τὸν ἄνδρα, γνωρίσας ὁ Βρέννος αὐτὸν ἐπεμαρτύρατο θεοῦς, ὡς παρὰ τὰ κοινὰ καὶ νενομισμένα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὅσα καὶ δίκαια πρεσβευτοῦ μὲν ἤκοντος πολέμια δὲ εἰργασμένον. He then demanded the surrender of the Fabii unless the Romans were prepared to regard the crime as a public act on their part.' We read that the *fetiales* urged the necessity of such a surrender, but the people refused to comply with the demand. Again we find among the Romans that regular war (*justum bellum*) could only be carried on with states definitely regarded as belonging to the family of nations, while the pirate occupied a position similar to that which he is regarded as holding in modern international law, and was simply *communis hostis omnium*.

Indeed both Greeks and Romans had a very clear conception of their respective international rights and liabilities. The Greek outlook was naturally limited by a sharp division drawn between Hellenes and 'barbarians,' only the former of whom could in most instances be regarded as entitled to the rights of international law, much in the same way as modern jurisprudence makes a distinction between civilised states and savage races. The dominion of the Greeks was shortlived, and the genius of the people was rather inclined to the logic of art and speculation than to the reasoning of the lawgiver. The Romans, on the other hand, with a tremendous legal genius, were possessed of a military power of expansion and government, which inevitably tended, simply from geographical considerations, to obscure the international side of their jurisprudence. By the time their legal system had fully developed, the growth of their Empire had almost left public international law without any scope for its exercise. We find, however, especially in Rome, very clear and definite regulations for such matters as the conduct of war, the observance of treaties, the exterritoriality of ambassadors and other matters which opinion has been too prone to consider as con-

ceptions of entirely modern origin. Rome invariably insisted that war should be *justum bellum* and not *more latronum*. Thus a specific *casus belli* was always required, followed by a formal demand for satisfaction (*rerum repetitio* or *clarigatio*), which was followed by an equally formal *belli indictio* pronounced by the *fetiales*. The basis of the observance of treaties was found in the Roman *bona fides*, and, as Dr. Phillipson says in his book, which imparts a completely unique and new aspect of the subject—'if the fundamentally legal nature of such compacts were not really recognised by the Romans, all the provisions relating thereto in the Codes, all the statements and detailed reports of early writers . . . would amount to a mere chimaera or to a huge hypocrisy.'

In the realm of private law, for which there was naturally more scope, we find very elaborate systems in existence. Special laws dealt in Greece and Rome with the naturalisation of foreigners. In its distinction between *jus originis* and *jus domicilii* the Roman law largely forestalled the attitude of Savigny. In the institution of *προξενία* we have a fairly accurate anticipation of the modern consular system. Special Greek courts existed for the trial of commercial cases between parties of different nationalities. We find the rudiments of prize courts, a dawning conception of the principles of neutrality and even references to the arbitration of an ἑκκλητος πόλις in the case of both private and public disputes. Nor can it reasonably be urged that ancient international law partook less of the character of true jurisprudence because in the obligations of religion there was largely supplied the binding force of a sanction for which we look in vain in modern days.

Dr. Phillipson has produced a book which from its erudition and vast research as well as from its clear logical force may be regarded as both excellent and unique. He claims with justice that he offers to the reader 'the first comprehensive and systematic account of the subject that has appeared in any language.' With his conclusions as a whole the scholar will be compelled to



agree. One would hesitate to say that he has not occasionally been led by the fascination of his argument to conclusions for which he hardly produces adequate authority. Thus he asserts the territorial appropriation of the sea, not only without quoting authority, but apparently in contradiction of the civil

law. The work, however, may be said to stand quite alone in its fund of information and to be one of the most scholarly contributions ever made to the study of international law.

J. S. BLAKE REED.

33, King Street, Manchester.

### CALPURNII ET NEMESIANI BUCOLICA.

*Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica recognovit Caesar Giarratano.* Pp. xxviii+78. Neapoli apud Detken et Rocholl. 1910.

THIS work is a critical edition presenting a full and valuable résumé of the readings contained in the MSS. or suggested by various commentators. Some years since Signor Giarratano's edition of Valerius Flaccus was recognised as supplying an excellent basis for determining the text of the *Argonautica*. In the volume now before us he has rendered a similar service to the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius Siculus and Nemesianus.

An editor of Calpurnius has to decide whether he will follow the MSS. and include the *Eclogues* of Nemesianus in his work or whether deferring to the now generally accepted difference of date between the two poets he will omit the *Eclogues* of the latter writer. Many years ago the late Dr. Garnett in an article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* maintained the late date of Calpurnius, whom he placed in the time of Gordian III., some fifty years before the time of Nemesianus. He subsequently in the *Journal of Philology* defended the same view with characteristic learning and acumen. Dr. T. Maguire also—who was for many years Professor of Latin in Queen's College, Galway, and afterwards a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin—maintained the late date of the *Seven Eclogues* of Calpurnius, arguing that they could not belong to the time of Nero because he thought (on insufficient grounds as was afterwards shown) that a certain passage iv. 117 sq. must refer to a law of Hadrian, and on account of a general impression of lateness that the language and tone of the poems made on him.

He, however, placed Calpurnius not in the time of the Gordians, but in that of Commodus.

On the other hand, the arguments for placing Calpurnius in Nero's time were very fully and forcibly stated by Moritz Haupt, and the difficulties urged by Dr. Garnett against accepting that view have been satisfactorily met by Dr. Postgate in an article he contributed some years ago to the *Classical Review*; so that Calpurnius and Nemesianus are now almost universally held to belong to widely different periods.

Notwithstanding this, however, most editions (with the notable exception of the *Corpus*) follow the example of the MSS. and present the two groups of *Eclogues* together, as Signor Giarratano does in the work before us. This course he further justifies by the similarity of the subject-matter of the two groups of *Eclogues*—a similarity that no doubt originally led to their being placed together in the MSS.

Signor Giarratano has put scholars under an obligation by the industry with which he has collected and the care with which he has classified the various readings of the not inconsiderable number of MSS. and editions in which the *Eclogues* have appeared. Besides making a minute study of the two chief MSS. he has himself also collated no less than thirteen MSS. of the second class, referred to collectively as V. He has recorded all that is of importance in the MSS.; but he has not only given the reader the advantage of seeing in one conspectus the variants of the several MSS.; he has also estimated with discrimination the relative value of the several MSS. themselves for determining the text, and has stated



in detail the reasons that guided him in forming his estimate. Perhaps the most valuable part of his work is the Introduction, in which he gives an analysis of the contents of his elaborate apparatus criticus and supplies a clue to guide us through a mass of details that might easily have proved bewildering.

Adopting the division of the MSS. into three classes, representing severally three copies of the archetype, to one or other of which all existing MSS. may be referred, he places in the first class as the most reliable authority for the text the *Codex Neapolitanus* (N) and the *Codex Gaddianus* (G), of both of which he has made a fresh and careful collation. These MSS. are of the fifteenth century. The importance of N has long been recognised. G was brought into notice by Baehrens. Giarratano seems to be the first editor to determine by a detailed examination the relative importance of the two MSS. His general conclusion is that though on the whole N is to be preferred to G as being more carefully written and as being more free from arbitrary interpolations, yet absolute preference should not be given either to N as is done by Schenkl or to G as is done by Baehrens, but that the MSS. should be regarded as supplementing one another and jointly supplying the means of arriving at the text of the archetype.

As compared with N and G the MSS. of class V, though not negligible, are to be used with caution, a conclusion at which Signor Giarratano arrives after a detailed examination of numerous passages.

Of the remaining class, designated P, we have but one specimen, viz., *Parisinus* 8049, assigned by Haupt to the thirteenth century, by Schenkl to the twelfth. This MS. Glaeser pronounces to be excellent. Signor Giarratano, on the contrary, says of it: "Codicem Parisinum librarius linguae Latinae prorsus ignarus exaravit, qui negligentissime suo munere functus innumeros scribendi errores commisit."

The discrepancy, however, between the views of the two editors is not so great as it appears at first sight, for Signor Giarratano thinks that the very ignorance of the copyist gives a special value to some of his readings which

seem to be correct; so incompetent a scholar could not, he thinks, have himself suggested these more excellent readings, but must have derived them from the archetype. He therefore thinks that in P we have a not unimportant help for determining the text, and he regrets that we have so small a part of it available, for it breaks off abruptly at Calp. iv. 12.

Signor Giarratano does not offer many conjectural emendations of his own, indeed not quite half a dozen. His most convincing suggestion is perhaps his rearrangement of the amoebaeon song in Calp. iv. The difficulties about this song are that the number of strophes as they appear in our texts is uneven, and the pairs of strophes do not always correspond to one another in subject-matter in the manner that might naturally be expected. These difficulties Signor Giarratano endeavours to remove, as Schenkl and other critics have also done, partly by assuming the loss of one strophe and partly by rearranging the existing strophes. Signor Giarratano, however, differs from his predecessors both as to the stanzas to be transposed and as to the place in which he thinks the lacuna should be marked. The arrangement he introduces, based as it is on a judicious consideration of the song as a whole, makes a distinct improvement in the sense and symmetry of the poem.

Of his remaining conjectures *Sic licet* in Calp. iii. 72 for *Scilicet* of most MSS. and editions is particularly happy and seems to be supported by the reading *Si licet* cited by Wernsdorf from Doru. (i.e., probably the MS. which Glaeser describes as D 4), one of the very few variants that have escaped our editor's notice.

In some cases where he departs from the reading of N G it could be wished he had stated the reasons that led him to do so. For example in Nem. i. 49 he adopts *letali* of V in preference to *mortali* (*frigore*) the reading of N G. Glaeser and Schenkl seem to be right in retaining the latter reading with the sense, the chill of death 'such as mankind are liable to,' a meaning which is more clearly defined by *Lege hominum* in the following line and which may

perhaps be illustrated by Calp. iv. 139, where the term of life allotted to man *mortale* (*pensum*) is contrasted with the everlasting life of the gods (*perpetuo caelestia fila metallo*). The somewhat unfamiliar use of *mortali* would account for the change to *letali*. If the archetype had *letali* it is hard to see why *mortali* should have ousted that word.

He is doubtless right in adopting *Perdit* in Nem. iv. 22, for *Perdunt* of N, which implies a nom. sing. *spinum*. *Perdunt* may be a dittography from the preceding line and was in any case the more readily introduced because the two other verbs in the clause are plural.

In Calp. iv. 91 *fructificat* of G (N reads *frutificat*) is retained by an over-

sight, though Barth's conjecture *visurae*, which is adopted in the preceding line, requires *fructificant*.

For the most part Signor Giarratano confines himself to printing without note or comment what he considers best among the readings appearing in the MSS. or proposed by previous editors. His full statement of the authorities, however, and his judicious appraisal of their value, not only enable the student to judge the merit of the reading adopted in each case, but also furnish to him the necessary apparatus to work with should he be dissatisfied with the reading presented and wish himself to essay the task of emendation.

C. H. KEENE.

#### NEW EDITIONS OF LIVY.

*Titii Livi A.U.C. Libri*: ed. pr. curavit GUL. WEISSENBORN, ed. alt. curavit GUL. HERAEUS. Pars V., Fasc. 1, Lib. XXXIX. and XL. 8vo. Pp. xvi. + 112. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. 85 pf. stitched, or M. 1.25 cloth.

*T. Livi Periochae omnium librorum. Fragmenta Oxyrhynchi reperta. Iulii Obsequentis prodigiorum liber*, ed. OTTO ROSSBACH. Photo reprod. of portion of Papyr. Oxy. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. M. 2. 80 stitched; M. 3. 20 cloth.

In this edition of books XXXIX. and XL. Dr. Heraeus continues the revision of the Weissenbornian edition of Livy, where the late M. Mueller left off, yet the Praefatio Critica is relative to Madvig's text; why this is so I cannot say. Anyhow, the consequence is that the reader must not expect so much information about the text as is given by the late Anton Zingerle (whose review of this vol. appeared in the *Wochenschrift* of May 6 after his lamented death in December last); in fact, the Preface is often obscure without reference to Zingerle's or Drakenborch's edition. Placed too where it is, and printed in the usual consecutive way, it is difficult to use; moreover, it needs revision, having

several misprints<sup>1</sup> (e.g. on p. xi the note on c. 21. 11 comes after the note c. 22. 10; the figure xxxiv. should come before 2 one line higher) and a misstatement or two (e.g. the reading of Lov. 2 at XL. 12. 5 according to Zingerle and Drakenborch is *reliquum*, not *reliqui*); also space is often needlessly taken up with friendly notices of Novák's vain suggestions, while the note on XL. 55. 4 is intelligible only when one discovers through Zingerle that Heraeus is rejecting Novák's *rex*.

The general characteristic of the critical notes is, like Zingerle's, a preference for the cdd. recc., especially Lov. 2, Harl., and Mead. 1, and for

<sup>1</sup> Other misprints are these: P. iii, for Cap. III. 1 write Cap. III. 2; p. vi, insert 11 before *pecuniae*; p. vii, XLIII. should be XLII.; p. viii, XLVIII. 1 should be XLVIII. 2, and 9, 3 should be 9, 4; p. ix, for VI. 3 write VI. 4; at the bottom of p. xi, correct further by changing 49 to 4; and on the same page, in the note on c. 34. 14, K should be H; p. xiii, line 2, write *ib.* for 2; in the 3rd line, 2 for *ib.*; and in the 6th line, 4 for 3; and in the 7th, XLVI. for XLV. It would also be more convenient for use if pp. iv-viii were headed 'Lib. XXXIX.', and pp. ix-xvi 'Lib. XL.', instead of all being headed 'Libri XXXIX. et XL.' The hopeless passage in XL. 52, 5 and 6 is obelised, but is neither wholly Moguntine nor, as in Zingerle's text, wholly emended, nor is the Moguntine text given in the preface.

the 'traditional text' against the lost Moguntine codex and the Moguntine edition. With Zingerle Heraeus prefers — what is a dactylic clausula—*si mens sana fuisset* (XL. 6. 4) to *si mens sana esset*, and rejects Madvig's *depugnatum est* (Ib. 34. 9) for the surely impossible subjunctive *depugnasset*, but Heraeus gets rid of the ugly *Asiageni* at XXXIX. 44. 1 for *Asiatico*. In his own conjectures the editor becomes bolder as he proceeds, and though, as is usually the fate of conjectures, few are convincing, they are generally worth careful consideration: one of the best is the transference of *per* (XXXIX. 42. 9) from before *saepe* to before *lasciuam* where it is needed; convincing too is *Mesembriamque* (XL. 58. 8) for *meridianam regionem*.

Another characteristic is the condemnation of words as being non-Livian such as *amandarent* (XXXIX. 13. 6), of M against *ablegarent* of cdd. recc., but as we have less than a quarter of Livy's A.U.C. the argument does not seem strong unless supported by some other evidence such as is given in the interesting note on *fidiora*<sup>1</sup> (Praef. on XL. 3. 4). There are in the preface other valuable notes and use of Insc. and of other new evidence, but Heraeus is not quite right in saying that no one has noticed the parallelism between Liv. XXXIX. 26. 9 and Cic. *de Rep.* I. 66 *nimis meracam libertatem*; for Lewis and Short have done so under 'merus,' though indeed their rendering of Livy's *meram* by 'immoderate, excessive' scarcely suits even *nimis avide* for which it was perhaps intended.

The thoughts suggested in reading an able and learned edition like this are mainly two: (1) Is it not time for some one, instead of merely revising a Weissenbornian or Madvigian text and the conjectures unearthed from learned periodicals, to overhaul the Drakenborchian MSS. and examine others afresh? Zingerle did 'yeoman's service,' at least in this decade, by examining the edd. vett., but we want also the best at any rate of the cdd. recc. The indefatigable Luchs has left little to be

done in this respect for the 3rd decade; and Vattasso urged this for the 4th decade as I pointed out in my review of his Roman fragments.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Has due consideration been given to the possibility that some of the numerous verbal differences such as *confisus* and *fretus* (XXXIX. 51. 4), *inflatis* and *ferocibus* (Ib. 30. 5), *iactaret* and *uenditaret* (Ib. 43. 9) between M and the recc. or between M and B may be due either to Livy himself or such early and responsible editors as the Symmachi. At any rate, the style of the variants and those two notable examples *priorum* (XXXIV. 36. 6) and *ait* (Ib. 37. 5) for *iratorum* and *pronuntiat* respectively in the Roman fragments suggest some such possibility, and that some of these variants have crept into M itself; this consideration makes me hesitate to accept Heraeus's excellent improvement *inuios montis*<sup>3</sup> *Ballistae saltus* on Gltlbauer's brilliant emendation *Suismontii Ballistaeque saltus* (XL. 53. 1) of the Moguntine ed. *inuios montes uallesque saltus*, for *saltus* looks like a mere variant of *montes*, especially with the *-que* in that position.

Iulius Obsequens, whose 'Prodigia' from Livy is before me in the other volume under review, suggests too that *Caietae* and *Formis* at XL. 2. 4 are mere variants of a similar character, and that there is no lacuna, for I. O. has only *Caietae*. Obsequens has so far not proved fertile for Livian emendations, and even misled Drakenborch at XXXIX. 22. 5; nor have the Oxyrhynchian fragments apparently done anything except confirm W. Schulze's spelling of *Faccenia* (XXXIX. 9. 5), as Heraeus points out. But it is very convenient to have the Periochae in a single volume with these and Obsequens, and we are deeply grateful to Professor Otto Rossbach for his excellent and handy edition, with its instructive preface, an up-to-date apparatus criticus at the foot of the pages, and a combined index of the three items of the book. This is certainly how the Periochae should be studied; when they are prefixed singly to parts of a different

<sup>1</sup> *fidissimus*, however, occurs at XXVII. 5. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1907.

<sup>3</sup> But *montes* in text.

author's work, as in the older editions of Livy, neither their historical work nor the critical value of their evidence for his text can be so fairly judged.

I am still puzzled as to the exact meaning of the publisher's 'geheftet'; yet a 'Teubner' has its advantages

when one is collating MSS., for a few of the loose pages can be taken away with one, and thereby the bulk of the daily bag of tools can be gratefully reduced.

W. C. F. WALTERS.

*University of London King's College.*  
November, 1911.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Vol. LIV. S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistolarum, Pars. I (Epp. 1-70), ed. I. HILBERG. I vol. 8vo. Pp. vi + 708. Vienna: Tempsky, 1910. M. 2250.

It is impossible to review an elaborate critical edition of a classical author till the *prolegomena* in which the editor explains his method have appeared. Dr. Hilberg of Czernowicz, to whom this important part of St. Jerome's writings has been entrusted, is reserving this information for his third and last volume. Nothing can be made of the vague critical notes of Martianay and Vallarsi, and so we have no standard of comparison; but it is clear that Hilberg is a careful and intelligent editor. As we should expect, his readings do not vary widely from those of the admirable Vallarsi, to whom he does an injustice in using only one symbol for the readings of former editors. The secular Vallarsi has stated his opinion of his Benedictine predecessor very clearly, and Martianay was, in fact, one of the weaker members of the Maurine congregation. It is, therefore, a pity that Hilberg often fails to discriminate between the cases in which he and Vallarsi stand together, and those in which he has Vallarsi and Martianay against him. The former are numerous and important, and it is misleading to allow the reader to suppose that Hilberg has been the first to ascertain the truth. The MSS. in fact are so good that their number does not cause much perplexity, and Hilberg is able to say that he has had to make few conjectures. While Vallarsi had access only to Italian MSS., the new editor has been fortunate in finding one at Lyons, imperfect it is true, yet of considerable

extent, which dates from the sixth century, and others in several libraries almost as old. This goodness of MSS. renders the Latinity less interesting; we have St. Jerome, the scholar and rhetorician, speaking with his own voice, and not the Jerome, encumbered with an old and quaint translation, with whom we are familiar in the Vulgate. Now that we have the beginnings of an authoritative text, though one in which changes will be less frequent than in many patristic writers, we shall be better able to appreciate Grützmacher and Brochet and the other modern scholars who have devoted themselves to the inexhaustible and always interesting Jerome.

E. W. WATSON.

*Excavation of the Roman Forts at Castleshaw (near Delph, West Riding).* By SAMUEL ANDREW, Esq., and MAJOR WILLIAM LEES, V.D., J.P. Second Interim Report, prepared by F. A. Bruton, M.A., with Notes on the Pottery by James Curle, F.S.A. With forty-five plates. (Manchester University Press.)

CASTLESHAW is a little Roman fort on the hills between Manchester and Huddersfield, close to the Roman road which connected Yorkshire with South Lancashire and, if a modern identification may be allowed, almost exactly over the Stanedge Tunnel. Mr. Bruton, working on behalf of Messrs. Andrew and Lees, conducted some excavations here in 1907, and he continued his good work in 1908. His report on the results of the former year was issued some time ago; now he describes the finds of 1908, and, as they are rather few, adds a good deal of general discussion of matters suggested



by Castleshaw and likely to interest antiquarian readers who know the district. To some critics the book may seem rather overloaded by such discussions. Others will probably find them interesting, and the volume will no doubt fulfil its purpose of drawing further attention to the site. The illustrations are numerous, though not all

new; plates 26 and 27, illustrating the use of the Pestle, are more comic than convincing. It is necessary to add that the excavation of Castleshaw is incomplete, and that it will not be to the credit of those concerned if it is left unfinished. It is an interesting place, and deserves proper treatment to the end.

F. H.

## NOTES AND NEWS

WE call attention to Prof. Harrower's Map of the Greekless areas of Scotland (see book list). It gives conclusive evidence that when Greek ceases to be compulsory, it gradually dies out of schools. In the northern area, for instance, 27 schools now teach Greek, as compared with 67 in 1888. It was assumed when the new rule came in that the Greek scholars would be concentrated in the larger schools; but on the contrary, even there the numbers have dwindled. One school that in 1906-7 had 127 learning Greek, now has 68; another instead of 30 has 2. We cited lately a case from America pointing the same way. All the evidence available points this way, and there is none at all on the other side.

Professor Mayor's *Twelve Sermons* (Pitt Press) is not quite within the scope of our Review, but we feel sure that all his friends and admirers will be glad to know of the book. It has something of the discursive charm of his talk, and it is worth having both for its strong and manly good sense and for its vigorous English style. What an ideal translator he would have been! Many who read these words will have heard him translate; the specimens in his *Juvenal* make us regret that he did not publish more.

Next month we hope to publish an answer of Professor Ridgeway to his critics.

## FRAGMENT OF AN UNKNOWN WRITER ON STYLE

(NOW FIRST PUBLISHED WITH VERSION).

<περὶ μὲν οὖν μετα>φορᾶς εἰρήσθω οὕτως. περὶ δὲ ταυρισμοῦ λοιπὸν διελεῖν· μεταφορὰ γάρ τις ὁ ταῦρος· ἐπεὶ δὲ τρεῖς οἱ ταῦροι, ὁ μὲν γὰρ φυσικὸς, ὁ δὲ ἐν κεραμοπωλείῳ λεγόμενος, ὁ δὲ Μιλήσιος, τούτων δὲ ὁ μὲν εἰς ἀπλῶς λέγεται, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι ὁμώνυμος, περὶ τούτου ἂν εἴη σκεπτέον. ὅθεν δὲ ὠνόμασται ἐκ τῶνδε διασκοπούμενοις δῆλον ἔσται· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἀπὸ Μιλησίων τῶν ἐν Ταύροις οἰκούντων λέγεσθαι Ταῦρος καὶ Ταυρισμός, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ Σολοικισμός. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ

‘Μιλήσιοι ἀξύνετοι μὲν οὐκ εἰσιν.’

THIS description of metaphor may suffice: it remains now to give an analysis of the use of the ‘Bull,’ for a ‘Bull’ is a kind of metaphor. Now there are three kinds of bulls: the natural bull, the so-called ‘bull in a china-shop,’ and the Milesian Bull. The first only of these is properly so-called, the others being the same only in name. We have now to deal with the last-mentioned. The origin of the name will be obvious in view of the following facts—popular opinion refers ‘Bull’ to the Milesians of Tauri, and we may compare the origin of ‘Solecism.’ From the same source comes the familiar saying ‘The Milesians are no fools.’

τὸ δ' εἶδος οὐχ ἀπλοῦν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ μεταθέσιν καὶ τὸ ἀνάλογον, ἥτοι μέρους πρὸς μέρος ἢ μέρους πρὸς ὅλον· ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ παραδόξου καὶ παραλόγου περαίνων † [τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν] †.

τὰ δ' εἶδη λέγω τοῦτο μὲν τὸ

‘πῶς δ' ἂν, ὅστις οὐκ ἔφυν ὄρνις, γενοίμην ἐν τόποις δισοοῖς ἅμα;’

—οὐδὲ γὰρ κἂν ὄρνις. τοῦτο δὲ, μέρους πρὸς ὅλον, τὸ ‘εἰς δύο τρίτας δεκατευθῆναι,’ τὸ γὰρ δεκατεύεσθαι σφαγῆναί τι. μέρους δὲ πρὸς μέρος τὸ ‘μολυβδῶ ὑποχαλκωθῆναι,’ ὡς ὁ τὰς οἰκίας, καὶ γὰρ τὸ ὑποχαλκωθῆναι στέγεσθαι τι καὶ τὸ ἐρέφεσθαι, ὡς μέρη πρὸς ὅλον, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ κατὰ ταῦτά.

τούτων δὲ κειμένων ἔποιτ' ἂν τὸν ὀρισμὸν ζητεῖν καὶ τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι. ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλὰ αἱ οὐσίαι, οὐ ῥάδιον ἔσται ἐνὶ ὀρισμῷ συλλαβεῖν· βέλτιστον δὲ τὸ ‘εἰ βούς πολλὰς ἐωράκοι ἐν ἀγρῷ κειμένας, ὦν τὸν ἓνα ἐστάναι, ταῦρον ἂν εἶναι.’ ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀπλῶς· αὐτὸ γὰρ εἰσάγει· ὁ γὰρ ταῦρος βούς τις. περὶ μὲν οὖν ταυρισμοῦ διωρίσθω κατὰ ταῦτα.

‘Bulls’ are not all of the same class, one being arrived at by transference through analogy, either a part being used for a part, or a part for the whole; the other expressing <its meaning> through paradox and paralogy.

Of the various classes, the last is represented by the saying, ‘Not being a bird, how can I be in two places at once?’—for even if he were, he could not. An example of the transference of a part to the whole is the phrase, ‘decimated to the extent of two-thirds,’ for ‘being decimated’ is a kind of ‘being slaughtered.’ An example of the transference by analogy of part to part is ‘copper-bottomed with lead,’ as the sailor said about the houses; for both ‘to be copper-bottomed’ and ‘to be roofed’ are a kind of ‘being covered,’ this being the whole of which they are parts, though they are not applicable to the same things or the same parts of them.

This being taken as settled, the next thing is to seek for a definition and an account of its innermost nature. Since it manifests itself in many forms, we shall have some difficulty in comprising it under a single definition. The best attempt was made by the man who said, ‘If I told you I had seen a lot of cows lying in a field, one of which was standing up, it would be a Bull’; but this is not perfect, for it introduces into the definition the very thing which is to be defined, since ‘bull’ is a kind of ‘cow.’ This completes our description of the use of the Bull.

J. F. DOBSON.

*The University, Bristol.*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

\* \* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

Adam (A. M.) *The Need for a Course of Study in Classical and Later Literature combined.* 7" x 5". Pp. 15. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1912. 6d. net.

Bevan (E.) *The Seven against Thebes of Aeschylus rendered into English Verse.* 7½" x 5". Pp. 96. London: Edward Arnold, 1912. Cloth, 2s. net.

Bury (J. B.) *History of the Eastern Roman Empire (from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I.), A.D. 802-867.* 9" x 6". Pp.

xiv + 530. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912. Cloth, 12s. net.

Cicero (Cato Maior de Senectute) Recensuit Carolus Simbeck. 9" x 6". Pp. 60. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 2.40.

*Classical Philology*, VII. 2. Pp. 137-262. Chicago: University Press, April, 1912. \$3 yearly.

Conradt (C.) *Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes.* III. Teil. 8. Σφήκες. 9. Εἰρήνη. 10. Ἐκκλησία.

- σάκουσαι. 11. Πλοῦτος. 10½" × 8". Pp. 43. Leipzig: G. Fock, 1912.
- Cooke (H. P.) The Teaching of Philosophy to Pass-men. 8¼" × 5½". Pp. vi + 18. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, 1912. 6d.
- Crittenden (A. R.) The Sentence Structure of Virgil. 8¾" × 6". Pp. 72. Ann Arbor, 1911.
- De Petra (J.) Sumbolae Litterariae in honorem eius. Dederunt Amici, Collegae, Discipuli. 10¼" × 6½". Pp. xxi + 336. Naples: A. Pierro, 1911. L. 12.
- Dickins (G.) Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum. Vol. I., Archaic Sculpture. 7¾" × 5½". Pp. viii + 292. With numerous illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Die Griechische und Lateinische Literatur und Sprache von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, etc. Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. 10" × 6¾". Pp. viii + 582. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 12.
- Edwards (G. M.) An English-Greek Lexicon. 8½" × 7". Pp. xxxii + 332. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Ehrle (F.) and Liebert (P.) Specimina Codicum Latinorum. 12" × 8". Pp. viii + 50. Bonn: Marcus and Weber; and Oxford: Parker and Son. 6s. net.
- Eureinor (G.) Russia's Policy in Finland. Translated by V. E. Marsden. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 44. London: Wyman and Sons, Ltd., 1912. 4d.
- Finsler (G.) Homer in der Neuzeit, von Dante bis Goethe. Italien, Frankreich, England, Deutschland. 9" × 6". Pp. xiv + 530. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 12.
- Friedländer (P.) Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius, Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit. Mit 11 Textabbildungen und 2 Tafeln. 9¼" × 6½". Pp. vi + 310. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 10.
- Hardie (W. R.) Silvulae Academicae. 9½" × 5¾". Pp. 118. Oxford: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Harrison (J. E.) Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion, including chapters contributed by Professor Gilbert Murray and F. M. Cornford. 8¾" × 5½". Pp. xxxii + 559. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Harrower (Prof.) Map of the Greekless Areas of Scotland, with Notes. 10" × 6". Pp. 8 and map. Aberdeen: University Press, 1912. Twopence net.
- Haupt (M.) und Saupe (H.) Sammlung Griechischer und Lateinischer Schriftsteller mit Deutschen Anmerkungen, 8½" × 5¼". Ciceros Ausgewählte Reden, Achter Band (W. Sternkopf), pp. 120, M. 1.20. M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus (H. Röhl), pp. 98, M. 1.20. Vergils Gedichte. Buch I.-VI., Der Aeneis (P. Jahn), pp. vi + 341, M. 3.20. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912.
- Heidrich (G.) Claudius Rutilius Numatianus. 10" × 7". Pp. 56. Vienna: C. Fromme, 1912.
- Homer's Iliad (Pope) Edited by C. E. Rhodes. With Introduction, Notes, and a Glossary. 5¾" × 4¼". Pp. xxviii + 642. Pocket Classics. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911. 1s. net.
- Humanistic Papers. Second Series. I. The Languages in American Education. II. Reform in Grammatical Nomenclature. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club and Classical Conference held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1911. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 64 each.
- Isocrates (Cyprian Orations) Evagoras, ad Nicoclem, Nicocles aut Cyprii. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. S. Forster. 7½" × 5". Pp. 160. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Jaeger (W. W.) Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles. 9½" × 6¼". Pp. vii + 198. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 5.
- Janell (W.) Nicodemus Frischlinus Julius Redivivus. Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler, Heft 19. 7¾" × 5". Pp. xci + 155. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 5.
- Kromayer (J.) Antike Schlachtfelder. Dritter Band: Italien und Afrika. Erste Abteilung: Italien. Mit 10 Lithographischen Karten und 35 Abbildungen im Text. 9¾" × 6¼". Pp. xiv + 494. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 20.
- Kühner (R.) Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweite Auflage. Band I., Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre, neubearbeitet von Dr. F. Holzweissig. 9¼" × 6¼". Pp. xvi + 1127. M. 24, (M. 26 bound). Band II., Satzlehre. Teil I., neubearbeitet von Dr. C. Stegmann. Pp. xii + 828. M. 18, (M. 20 bound). Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Lucretius (Treasures of) Selected Passages from De Rerum Natura. Translated into English verse by H. S. Salt. 7½" × 5". Pp. 63. London: Watts and Co., 1912. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Marucchi (O.) Christian Epigraphy; with a Collection of Ancient Christian Inscriptions, mainly of Roman Origin. Translated by J. A. Willis. 6" × 4". Pp. xii + 460, with 30 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Meillet (A.) Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes. (Troisième édition, corrigée et augmentée.) 9" × 5¾". Pp. xxvi + 502. Paris: Hachette and Co., 1912. Fr. 10.
- Michaut (G.) Sur les Tréaux Latins (Histoire de la Comédie Romaine). 8" × 5". Pp. 455. Paris: Fontemoing and Co., 1912. Fr. 6.
- Neugebauer (P. V.) Sterntafeln, von 4,000 vor Chr. bis zur Gegenwart. 10" × 7". Pp. 88. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912. M. 4.20.
- Newman (M. L.) Easy Latin Plays. 6" × 4". Pp. 32. London: Geo. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1912. Limp cloth, 6d.
- Nunn (H. P. V.) A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek. 7½" × 5". Pp. xii + 140. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

- Otte* (H.) Kennt Aristoteles die sogenannte tragische Katharsis? 9" x 5½". Pp. 63. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 1.60.
- Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Vol. VII., Fornax—Helikeia. By G. Wissowa and W. Kroll. 10" x 6½". Pp. 1474-2879. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1912. M. 15.
- Peter* (H.) Wahrheit und Kunst Geschichtsschreibung und Plagiat im Klassischen Altertum. 9" x 5½". Pp. xii + 490. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 12.
- Powell* (G. H.) Burlesques and Parodies. 7½" x 5". Pp. 55. Cambridge: Hefner and Sons, Ltd., 1912. 1s. net.
- Prehistoric Thessaly*. By A. J. B. Wace and M. S. Thompson. 12" x 9½". Pp. xvi + 272. With a map, 6 coloured plates, and 151 figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Reitzenstein* (R.) Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche, bei Apuleius. 8" x 5½". Pp. 92.
- Schoff* (W. H.) The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. Travel and Trade in the Indian Ocean, by a Merchant of the First Century. Translated from the Greek. 9½" x 6". Pp. 323. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Sleeman* (J. H.) Caesar in Britain and Belgium. Simplified Text. 6½" x 4½". Pp. xxx + 124. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Sturtevant* (E. H.) Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Labial Terminations II. 10" x 7". Pp. 46. Chicago: University Press; and Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Teubner's Texts*. Carmina Anacreontica (Preisendanz), pp. xx + 66, M. 1. Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea (Susemihl), pp. xxx + 279, M. 2.40. Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio Physica (Ritzenfeld), pp. xvi + 78, M. 1.80. Xenophontis Scripta Minora, Fasc. Posterior (Ruehl), pp. xxiv + 200, M. 1.60. M. Minucii Felicis Octavius (Waltzing), pp. xii + 76, M. 1. S. Abercii Vita (Nissen), pp. xxiv + 150, M. 3.20. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. 6½" x 4½". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912.
- Thompson* (J.) A First-Year Latin Book. 7" x 5". Pp. xvii + 227. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s.
- Thumb* (A.) Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Translated from the German (second edition) by S. Angus. 9" x 5½". Pp. xxxv + 370. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Usener* (H.) Kleine Schriften. Erster Band. Arbeiten zur Griechischen Philosophie und Rhetorik. Grammatische und Textkritische Beiträge. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 400. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 12.
- Wolff* (S. L.) The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. 7" x 5". Pp. x + 529. New York: The Columbia Press, 1912. Cloth, \$ 2.
- Zabughin* (V.) Giulio Pomponio Leto, Saggio Critico. Vol. II. Testo e Note. 9" x 6½". Pp. xxvii + 238. With 9 plates. Genoa: Grottaferrata, 1912. L. 10.
- Chiaroscuri Umanistici. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 18. Rome: Tipografia Romana, 1910.
- L'Umanesimo nella Storia della Scienza. 10" x 6½". Pp. 15. Rome: Co-operativa Tipografica Manuzio, 1911.
- Scholiastarum Vergilianorum Reliquiae in Pomponii Laeti Codicibus Servatae. 7½" x 4½". Pp. 23. Caenobium Cryptoferratense, 1911.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free).

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. J. H. Sleeman, The University, Sheffield, and Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. S. Lilley, Girls' High School, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. K. Forbes, 135, Chatham Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.